

THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOL. II. No. 2

APRIL, 1909.

THE REPORTS OF THE POOR LAW COMMISSION.

I. THE MAJORITY REPORT.

The main recommendations contained in the Majority Report and in the separate Report of the four Dissentients are already familiar to the public, and especially, no doubt, to the readers of this *Review*. I will not, therefore, devote space to a sketch of them in outline, but will at once attempt to draw out the very interesting conflict of ideas which underlies the conflict of proposals.

1. The conflict begins with the estimate of the actual situation. Using in a great measure identical descriptions of fact, and agreeing in a condemnation of many features of the present administration, the two reports nevertheless display from the beginning an irreconcilable divergence in their reading of the circumstances. The majority of the Commission regard the evils revealed by their report as a failure of adjustment to new demands and conditions—to the heightened demands made possible by the success of an earlier reform, and to conditions complicated by the economic and industrial changes of the 19th century.

"In tracing the development of Poor Law administration during the last century we feel that it has been continuously in the direction of clearer differentiation of the problem and closer adaptation of treatment to the needs of different classes. This would become possible only with the gradual lifting of the overwhelming burden of able-bodied pauperism. Rashly assumed responsibility for the maintenance of large numbers of able-bodied and their dependents had, prior to 1834, swamped the more delicate and discriminative work of dealing with the infirm, the sick, and the children, in much the same way as the presence of an epidemic demands drastic and general treatment and distracts attention from more individual and subtle ills. It is the great merit of the early Poor Law and of early sanitary reformers to have checked the overwhelming evils of their day, and so to have cleared the way for the progressive treatment of difficulties which were then thrown into the background.

Granting that the position has changed, the question arises how far the law and its administration are now adequate to deal with it. It cannot be assumed that a Poor Law system which has done good work in the past, calls therefore for no change; indeed, just so far as the system has succeeded in modifying the conditions of the poor it has changed its own problem, and it may well be that corresponding changes are called for in itself—that after the first rough work is done a constantly finer instrument is needed to carry out the more specialised branches. To a large extent this specialisation of work and improvement of the instrument was foreseen and intended by the early administrators, and has been steadily progressing during the last seventy years, and indeed most of the demands for further change lie in the same direction."

Some administrators, they hold, have risen to the newer problems, and in various lines of construction have inaugurated the road to progress; others have failed to realise their growing responsibilities, and to seize the opportunities for better administration of which many have availed themselves. The Majority's judgment of the work of existing Boards of Guardians is therefore discriminative.

"We welcome the opportunity of putting on record our high appreciation of the steadfastness and wisdom which have marked the work of such Boards. We earnestly hope that, if our recommendations take effect, every effort will be made to secure the continued services of such Guardians. But there is at present no adequate means of raising the standard of work to this high level, nor of ensuring that the [bad] condition of things to be found in many Unions shall be impossible for the future. It would seem to be imperative in the interests of good administration that the work of relief should be entrusted to persons secure both from external pressure and from the temptations of self-interest." It is noteworthy, however, that for them it is no class-question; "it is not a question of the social status of the Guardian, still less of wealth or poverty. I have known some of the best Guardians the poorest and *vice versa*."

The object of the Majority's proposals, then, is by securing competent administrative bodies and setting up a service of Public Assistance to obtain for the future such a level of work as has in many respects already been achieved, and to remove the hindrances which obstruct further advance on the lines of the progress which has been made—for example, the obstacle to classification by institutions, which the smallness of the Union area presents, considering the disinclination of Boards of Guardians to combine. It is right in principle, they hold, to have a single organised system for dealing with those who have recourse to public assistance; and the defects which they find in the system are defects of application of a sound principle, in that fullest sense in which new application is itself the development of an idea.

The attitude of the Dissentients is radically different. They take every occasion of speaking highly of the personal character and services of the members of existing Boards of Guardians without discrimination, and they throw the onus of the evils which both Reports emphasise, on the fundamental nature of the system which these authorities have been called upon to administer. Their polemical phrases "Destitution Authority" and "Destitution Officer" are coined in order to drive home this contention. Destitution, they hold is not a characteristic to which any common principle, nor, *a fortiori*, any common method, corresponds; and authorities called upon to deal with a class marked out by it are confronted in the nature of things with an impossible task.

"What is demanded by the conditions is not a division according to the presence or absence of destitution but a division according to the service to be provided." It has become increasingly plain to us in the course of our inquiry that the character of the functions entrusted to the Poor Law Authorities is such as to render their task, at best, nugatory; and, at worst, seriously mischievous."

The evils of to-day, for those who adopt this view, are not the evils of retarded adaptation to a real need in a rapidly changing environment; they are the evils of a misaken adaptation to a need, which, as a need reducible to a common type, does not exist.

2. Let us consider the consequences of these opposite attitudes, and discuss their justification.

The conception, we have seen, which governs the Majority Report is the conception of a hierarchy of authorities, each specially qualified and selected for the function which is to have the name of Public Assistance, disposing of an expert service under that title; the two in conjunction representing an essential organ of civilised group-life. Thus we are at the centre of all the recommendations when we meet with the proposal for the establishment of a Service of Public Assistance. For the processes of help contemplated by the report are to be "preventive, curative, and restorative"; and though, as we shall see, this does not mean a new departure in fundamental principle, yet it does mean such an advance, as practically to be a new departure, in adaptation and application.

These requisites of successful dealing with destitute or "necessitous" persons demand a strong and capable service, and ~~and~~ I quote part of the paragraph which motives this all-important recommendation.

"We are of opinion that a Public Assistance Service should be set up which should include all officers concerned with the supervision, control and disciplinary treatment of the poor—not only those who in the future will occupy positions analogous to that of the Inspector of Poor in Scotland, but also relieving officers both male and female, masters, matrons and superintendents of institutions of every grade, labour masters and mistresses. The service should be graded, and no person should be eligible for enrolment who had not received a certificate from a recognised Authority, showing that he possessed specific qualifications. In effect, every officer should realise in the early years of his career not only that he has to discharge certain formal duties, but that he is concerned with the moral training of those committed to his care. In our visits to the workhouses we have been impressed by the interest which the higher type of masters and matrons take in the moral recovery of inmates; with properly graded institutions this type of officer would become far more common than at present. We think that there should be more opportunity of promotion from the lower to the higher ranks in the service, that opportunities of specialised training should be provided, and that no question of superannuation should hinder the transfer of efficient and promising officers from one authority to another."

Three points should be noted in this statement of opinion; the proposed unity of the service; the proposed provision for special and expert training; and the fact that the unity and the proposed training rest upon the conception of the common work as in the largest sense of the term a moral problem. This last characteristic confronts us with the distinction between what we may call social therapeutics and the normal provision for health and education throughout the community. The conflict of ideas which I began by describing is, in other words, the question whether this distinction is justified; and the most useful thing we can do in the consideration of the two Reports is to try and throw light on this question.

But before proceeding with this which is the main argument, two matters should be mentioned which are relevant to the paragraph just quoted.

The first is a supplementation. Outside the Public Assistance Authorities and their service, the Commissioners contemplate the admission of charity, on condition of accepting some degree of public responsibility and recognition, to a co-operative share in the same work. Charity is here considered as equally with Public Assistance an essential organ of civilised group-life, equally with it removed from private dependence and caprice; but able to be freer in its methods and more enterprising in its designs than is wise for a state-organised service drawing directly upon public funds. There is a cry, based on misconception, "Not charity, but our rights." Now charity is an organ of the community, and for many cases the only possible organ, by which effect can be given to the rights that arise in certain kinds of emergency. If two facts were more commonly realised, the above misconception would be removed. One of them is the immense resources of minor endowed charities, distributed practically all over the country, mischievous as a rule to-day because not included in any rational co-operation. The other is, as we shall see more fully, the fact that the best methods and arrangements in the work of social improvement, those which meet with the most universal approbation, and especially with the approbation of the Dissentients' Report (*e.g.*, the institutions which have made possible the segregation of the Feeble-minded), are as a rule and in the most striking cases due to the enterprise and inventiveness of private charity. To deny it a place in the scheme of social assistance would be in practice to close the principal laboratory of social invention. This seems to be admitted in the Separate Report, with a suggestive remark to the effect that County Councils cannot be expected to do constructive

work of this kind. But its authors have not seen that the constructive work and inventiveness of charity is rooted in the methods and experience developed in touch with the homes. Institutions are but the permanent formulation of work done among the people; and not understanding this, they try to bar that employment of voluntary funds in highly adaptive work among the poor which is the very ground and source of the institutions they are glad to profit by. The Children's Care Committees, of which I shall speak below, are a remarkably clear example of the relation which they ignore.

The second point refers to a criticism which may conveniently be dealt with here. It is urged by the Dissentients that the aim of the proposed system of Public Assistance Authorities and Committees, which is really conceived in the same spirit as the service of Public Assistance, is to "withdraw the whole relief of distress from popular control." It has, they contend, "an undemocratic constitution," which makes the scheme politically quite impracticable.

We seem to have here a misrepresentation of fact *plus* an error of social theory. In fact, the proposed Public Assistance Authority would, in its origin and renewal, be wholly determined by the elective body, the Council of the County or County Borough, which appoints all its members (except on the special scheme for London, where it appoints three-quarters of them), one-third retiring annually. There is not in the proposed authority, as there is in Education Committees under the present law, any power of co-option; so that the elective body determines absolutely either the whole of the membership, or, in London, three-quarters of it. It is this authority so determined which appoints the (local) Public Assistance Committee, in which it is bound to include persons nominated by other elective bodies (District Councils), and what will obviously be a small minority nominated by the non-elective Voluntary Aid Committee, where one exists. The Council's power over the *personnel* of the Authority and the local Assistance Committee is much greater than in the case of the present Education Committees, and when this power is so complete a degree of independence in working is unimportant. The idea of throwing the whole supervision of Public Assistance with its institutions on County Councils without reinforcement was judged impracticable, and was not adopted in the proposals of the L.C.C., which assigned part of the work to the Borough Councils. The Dissentients' scheme avoids the difficulty of constituting an expert Public

Assistance Authority in touch with public opinion, by simply, as we have seen, refusing to provide any such organ at all.

But further, it is an error, I submit, in social theory, to take direct dependence either on a constituency or on an elective body as a test of the democratic character of an institution. The more powerful and secure the democracy, the better it can afford to give comparative independence to its authorities, with a view to the skilful and fearless execution of the policy which on the whole it approves. The distinction between the "general will" and the "will of all" is hard, no doubt, to apply in practice; but it is the one fundamental problem of democracy, which stands or falls by success in solving it. There are many signs that democracies are beginning to feel the truth of this; that is, to recognise the value of independent and comparatively permanent organs of their will, such as the one great traditional example—the English judiciary. The employment of co-optive statutory Education Committees is an example of this; so is the tendency to rely on the Director and the permanent official in the administration of public assistance elsewhere than in Great Britain. The true suggestion of social theory, as it appears to me, is that for a strong and secure democracy nothing is undemocratic except inefficiency.

3. I return, then, to the problem of what I will venture to call a single method and organ of social therapeutics. Its principle, I suggest, the principle of respect for the self-maintaining character, fertile in detailed applications for its conservation and restoration, is one that is relevant to an essential want, co-extensive with what may be called the failure of social self-maintenance; the failure, that is, to maintain one's self and one's dependents at the standard prescribed by society. The public is indebted, in my judgment, both to the Majority Report for the constructive ability with which this principle is elaborated in detail, and not very much less to the Report of the Dissentients for the uncompromising plainness with which they have insisted on their absolute rejection of it. It is public opinion that will decide; the Commission, through both its sections, has done all it can, in calling attention with perfect clearness to the parting of the ways.

The antagonism cannot be put too strongly. The Majority proceed upon the principle that where there is a failure of social self-maintenance in the sense above defined, there is a defect in the citizen character, or at least a grave danger to its integrity; and that therefore every case of this kind raises a problem which is "moral," in the sense of affecting the whole capacity of self-

management, to begin with in the person who has failed, and, secondarily, in the whole community so far as influenced by expectation and example. This relation to a man's whole capacity for self-management, his *moral*, is a distinctive feature, I take it, which separates the treatment required by the destitute or necessitous from anything that can be offered to citizens who are maintaining themselves in a normal course of life. The State imposes on the latter what it holds to be general conditions of good living; but all of these are partial, and need only a partial capacity and limited point of view in those who furnish the services—elementary education, let us say, or medical inspection. Such offers or conditions are general in application and limited in kind; there are a few special things which seem supremely important, and you press them upon everybody. In dealing with the destitute it is the other way on; you offer everything—the whole *matériel* and guidance of life—but you only offer it to the few in whom a certain disability exists.

Thus, in relation to these few, your task and problem becomes distinctively moral; it deals with their capacity of self-management; and the method which is demanded may be called social therapeutics—therapeutics of the whole person, not merely of his health or of his lack of the three R's.

From the point of view thus indicated there is, as it were, an army of social healers to be trained and organised; and it is like the army of war in the fundamental fact that it is to be disciplined and animated with a single spirit and purpose, however varied and specialised may be the duties that fall within its range. For thus everything turns on the fine adaptation of the institutions, and the expertness and devotion of the administering bodies, their officials, and their voluntary helpers. And the recommendations regarding the authorities and the service are directed to securing such a spirit of single-heartedness and co-operation from top to bottom of the hierarchy. This is why the Government Department concerned is to be strengthened and specialised; why qualifications are to be laid down for the office of general inspector, and for other officers throughout the service; why the Authorities and Committees are to be assigned areas specially appropriate to their respective functions, and opportunity offered for the free selection of the most efficient persons to be members; and why, through classification by institutions, and, where necessary, through increase of the staff and the co-operation of highly-trained volunteers, it is to be made possible for concentrated and specialised attention to be given by

volunteers and officials alike to the specific work before them. All this seems a mere common-sense arrangement to secure efficiency; and so no doubt it is. But nevertheless, it is the essence of the proposed reform; all the re-arrangements and contrivances are instrumental to it. The simple secret of the whole revolution—for it would be a revolution in practice—is to secure that every case of distress should be given the full and careful attention of a man or woman experienced in the cure and prevention of social failure, under an authority thoroughly versed in such matters and genuinely interested in them, being also in command of full information, and of the most ample institutional or professional resources to meet all special needs. The whole of these proposals are founded on the conviction that there is a problem common and peculiar to the entire range of destitution or necessitousness, demanding a common and peculiar method of dealing with it.

It is impossible to grasp the situation correctly unless we face the question of what is really involved in the ideas of the report of 1834. A passage in the Majority Report draws a sharp contrast between the "negative effects" which the Commissioners of that date had in view and the "restorative treatment of individuals" towards which the present proposals are directed. The distinction is quite intelligible; but there is no such breach of continuity as the form of expression might suggest. The policy of 1834, the passage continues, was successful in restoring and maintaining the independence of the main body of the working class. This is a startlingly positive aspect of a negative effect; and the truth is that there is apt to be a degree of misapprehension underlying the popular use of the term negative. In fact, as every disbelief is founded on belief, so every negative procedure is founded on a positive view and purpose; and the question of its value must always turn on what it is that is maintained by means of the denial. The positive faith which animated the negative recommendations of 1834 is not discontinuous with the convictions which suggest the "restorative treatment of individuals" to-day. And any reform will be fortunate which shall attain in its province so great a positive success as the reforms initiated in 1834 have had in theirs.

The Commissioners' principles of "all or nothing," and of "less eligibility," were drawn, as is well known, from the practice of the Friendly Societies in the administration of relief. They were solidly founded on the wisdom and experience of the wage-earners themselves; and they are developed and continued in the policy which we have been describing. For the point of that policy, as

we have seen, the point on which the whole argument hinges, is the necessity of separating the system of relief definitely and clearly from the normal system of self-maintenance. It is easy to provoke a laugh or a tear by asking, "Are you going to apply the principle of less eligibility, as the Commissioners of 1832 themselves did not propose, to children and the sick and aged, by making them worse off than the most wretched of those who have not applied for public assistance?" But all argument of this kind neglects, I suggest, the gist of the matter, which is really the same problem that we have been arguing all along. Nothing and no one can alter the nature of the situation. A genuine Collectivist Society would be, I am quite certain, the very last to attempt it. The "less eligibility" lies not in hardship or inadequate treatment, but in the surrender of self-management. I do not say this fundamental meaning was clear to the authors of the 1834 Report; but it was present in the operation of their proposals, and it has become clear now. It is something like—not for a moment do I identify it with—the right of punishment. You may treat your criminal as indulgently, as curatively, as comfortably as you think good for him and safe for society. But the essence is that he has done something which entitles society to mark its disapproval by taking hold of him, and managing him independently of his own will.

In the case of the person who comes to the public for assistance there is *prima facie* no disapproval to be marked; the only aim is restoration; but the greatest restorative force is the contrast between self-management, and a life under special conditions which society imposes as *in loco parentis* to him and his; and the terrible consequences of not recognising this distinction, and of treating, *e.g.*, the out-relief families as self-managing entities, is shown in the condition of the out-relief children, which is perhaps the most unexpected and terrible scandal revealed by the two reports.

But how, it may be asked, does this constructive lesser eligibility operate, when in certain cases you are doing all you possibly can to cure a patient or to fit a child for life? The answer is, that the principle as I have now interpreted it includes the older or more literal form of it, as a possible application in case of necessity. Your object is the restoration of the individual and the protection of society from temptation; your principle means primarily completeness of treatment and control, of all who fail in self-mainten-

ance; and where hardship is indicated as the remedy or preventive, you have power and justification to apply it.

Thus the principle of "less eligibility" is really continuous with the principle of modern public assistance, and does not involve any harshness of treatment such as to interfere with the restorative purpose of the relief. It is accepted, for instance, in the Berlin instructions, where such an interpretation is explicitly excluded.

It is plain, too, that in cases which are obviously exceptional, such as the need of a costly operation to preserve life, a public provision does not run the same risk of breaking down the system of self-maintenance as the provision for normal needs. This is a very obvious point, but important in the general argument because exceptions of this kind have been used to make the working definition of destitution seem so lax as to be futile. But if we keep the main purpose of public assistance clearly in mind, viz., restoration to self-maintenance and prevention of failure in it, we shall see that these exceptions readily fall into place. It is the same general rule as the paradox of normal social intercourse; it is dangerous and therefore insulting to offer to pay a friend's house rent or butcher's bill, though no fault is found with making him presents of superfluities to greatly higher values. The reason is plainly that help with normal wants—necessaries—tends to break down self-maintenance; while the gratification of exceptional wants has no such effect. Every man who has much experience of life must have seen cases of the decay and degradation which an infringement of this rule is apt to produce.

4. With these ideas before our minds, let us turn to the Separate Report.

"When a Destitution Authority departs from the simple function of providing bare maintenance under deterrent conditions, it finds it impossible to mark off or delimit its services from those which are required by and provided for the population at large. The function of preventing and treating disease among destitute persons cannot, in practice, be distinguished from the prevention and treatment of disease in other persons. The rearing of infants and the education of children whose parents are destitute does not differ from the rearing of infants and the education of children whose parents are not destitute. The liability of persons to be compulsorily removed from their homes, because they have become a public nuisance and a source of danger, must surely be the same whether or not they are technically 'destitute.' In short, if we are going to provide preventive and curative treatment, the category of the destitute becomes an irrelevancy. What is demanded by the conditions is not a division according to the presence or absence of destitution but a division according to the services to be provided. Each public service requires its own 'machinery of approach' of the population at large, its own technical methods of treatment of the class entrusted to it, its own specialised staff, and its own supervising committee, bent upon the

performance of the particular service. Those from whom the cost of their treatment ought to be recovered, can be effectively made to pay without vainly trying to separate the treatment of the destitute from the treatment of the poor."

The argument of this quotation goes to the root of the matter; and the principal question which public opinion will have to decide is whether this argument, or the ideas which have been suggested in the earlier part of this paper, are substantially sound. The Majority refer to the point in a section entitled "Breaking up of the Poor Law," from which, as we have dealt with the matter at length, a shorter quotation will suffice:—

"The question at issue is, whether the work of maintaining those members of the community who have lost their economic independence can be safely entrusted to authorities whose primary duty is something quite distinct—such as that of Education or Sanitation—or whether it is essential that there should be an authority devoting itself entirely to the work. We consider that the many and subtle problems associated with Public Assistance, especially when it is a family rather than an individual that requires rehabilitation, cannot be solved by the single process of sending off each unit to a separate authority for maintenance and treatment. What is needed is a disinterested authority, practised in looking at all sides of a question, and able to call in skilled assistance. The specialist is too apt to see only what interests him in the first instance and to disregard wider issues." (See also quotation p. 111 above.)

We have sufficiently illustrated the view of the Majority Report. Let us now look for a moment carefully and steadily at what is essential in the effective passage cited above from the Separate Report. Take, for example, the sentence beginning with the words "The function of preventing and treating disease. . . ."

Note first that the argument is so broadly stated as not to confine itself to families on the edge of destitution. The authors apparently believe, in all seriousness, that destitution or necessity, inability to reach the social standard of self-maintenance, makes no difference to the problem of medical prevention and treatment even as compared with the condition of a family in quite easy circumstances. Surely, in this broad form, which is essential to the argument, the contention will not stand a moment's consideration. In normal self-maintaining life the head of a household, man or woman, is sensitively anxious about any danger affecting the health of its members. He (including "she") either spends hard money on the sanitary inspection of his house, which the overworked local authority is not eager to undertake, or, if he is a wage-earner, he welcomes the sanitary adviser, official or volunteer, and carefully attends to his instructions. In the case of motherhood and infancy he is under the constant advice of the

family doctor; and again, if he is a wage-earner he is greatly aided by the Health Visitor or Visitor of the Care Committee, and by the medical inspection at the school, a general advisory service of the utmost value. When it is a question of treatment the doctor has merely to make his advice clear to the head of the household, and the treatment is carried out and the diet observed as a matter of course. With the steady-going wage-earner as with the middle class family—and the argument, we must remember, challenges a comparison with the middle class family—the doctor is strictly a “medical attendant.” He has to give medical advice on the conditions of health and on the treatment of ailments, and with that his work is done.

Compare with this the case of a family, destitute or necessitous in the sense above defined, with regard to the treatment or prevention of disease. Here there is an indefinite amount of difficulty in securing precautions or conditions. Whether the cause is fault or misfortune is irrelevant except in so far as the difficulty of applying a remedy is concerned. What is certain is that something is wrong, and that something beyond the art of doctor or health visitor or sanitary inspector as such. Somebody must play providence, and the whole destiny of the family may turn on whether he plays it wisely. It may be that an order for milk will be enough; it may be that a money allowance will be enough; or again it may be that some more deep-laid plan of assistance is necessary if the treatment is to be provided, prevention for the future secured, and the family freed from its incapacity. Consider the case which is so common and so critical, the first serious illness of a bread-winner earning fair wages, who is not in a club. Here it is not merely medical treatment that is needed, for no money is coming in; it is not merely home aliment, which a Health Committee might order; for that does no good for the future, but perhaps harm; it is not the threat or the procedure of recovery of cost when the man is again in work, for that is a negative measure indeed—the detached methods suggested by this paragraph are quite extraordinarily negative. Something is demanded different from all these and much more finely adjusted. Perhaps a temporary allowance on condition of joining a good club; perhaps provident visiting, which has pulled through many a household on the verge of permanent destitution. I have only taken comparatively easy cases, but in fact where destitution is found there will very frequently be much deeper and more subtle sources of trouble in fecklessness or worse on the part of the heads of the household.

Then comes the doubt whether the doctor's orders will be carried out even as well as conditions allow; whether the aliment will reach the member of the family for whom it is destined, or whether there is remediable waste in the family budget. The whole set of circumstances and habits and the use or non-use of opportunities, which, taken together, form the life of the household, are pretty certain to present numerous and difficult points on which restorative influence may operate. And it is certainly possible that the visitor of a Health Committee or of a Children's Care Committee may find out and deal with them. But she plainly will not do so if she simply specialises on health questions or on children's relief. And if she goes beyond her speciality and links herself with bodies working over the whole ground of assistance, then the principle of a general social therapeutics, from which friendly visiting has in fact drawn its strength and value, is acknowledged, and the detached methods of assistance are condemned.

It is hard to imagine how the paragraph I am discussing could have commanded the assent of anyone accustomed to confer and co-operate with medical men on the treatment of sickness in necessitous cases.

So with education. I should be the last person to disparage the education given by teachers in school hours; but to say that it is not more important than the education of the home is to speak far within measure. Now in case of a family which is not destitute society entrusts the home portion of life to the parent. For the destitute child or child of destitute parents society has set itself *in loco parentis*, and as we have seen in the case of the out-relief children, must take steps to discharge its responsibility even if the parents are on the spot. "But," we are told, "the Education Authority has boarding schools, and could take over the whole maintenance and supervision of the children as well as the teaching in school hours." Now, setting aside other objections, how about the out-relief children? Is the Education Authority to supervise the whole lives of children living at home, while other Committees supervise the lives of their parents in the same home? Is it not plain that education, like health, when coupled with necessitousness, demands the supervision of visitors and bodies whose scope goes beyond specialities, though the advice of all specialists will be at their command?

I may point out that there is no more difficulty in a Public Assistance Authority employing if necessary a Health or Education Authority as its agent than in a Health and Education Authority

using one another in this way, as suggested by the Separate Report (Ch. V. H. footnote). The idea that services cannot co-operate without the one absorbing the other, which figures in the proposals of the Dissentients regarding the health and medical services, as also regarding the education of children now under the Poor Law, is refuted by many of their own suggestions, and seems altogether groundless.

The problem of a general organ of public assistance I may add, is well illustrated by the Dissentients' proposal of a Registrar of Public Assistance. This has generally, I think, been felt to be a weak point in the scheme, and weak in a remarkable way, because it is a point which might be, and ought to be, strong, but has been explicitly restricted to prevent it from becoming so. Remove the prohibition on the Registrar to interfere with the treatment of cases; give him not merely enquiry officers with a view to recovery, who would be wholly useless for real assistance work, but a staff of trained visitors, paid, voluntary, or both; link him with a skilled Public Assistance Committee on the one hand, to advise him; and an enterprising Voluntary Aid Committee, on the other hand, to take the cases which need treatment by an organ, just as much the organ of the community, but more flexible and versatile—and you have the scheme of the Majority Report, perhaps a little improved by the higher status of the Registrar. And I believe that, prohibition or no prohibition, with a strong man as Registrar, something of the kind would happen, only he would be crippled by the inadequacy of his staff and of the specialised visitors who reported to him.

As the scheme stands, the weight of the "friendly visiting"—note the phrase, which is borrowed of course from the Boston Associated Charities,—lies on the Health Visitors, and the Visitors of the Children's Care Committees. The description of the relation of these visitors to the household is excellent, and if the scheme obtains the approval of considerate persons, it will be largely in virtue of this ideal of friendly visiting.

We have to consider, therefore, whether the conditions demanded by this ideal are consistent with the proposals of the Dissentients' Report, remembering what was pointed out above that Institutions are simply the formulation of private work.

It thus becomes all-important to observe that, like the institution of Friendly Visiting, the institution of Children's Care Committees at least was invented in a certain spirit and under certain definite conditions, and any attempt to make them general apart from these

conditions or a genuine equivalent—I do not for a moment argue against State adoption of them in some form—would be to separate them from the sources of their value. The dilemma is the same as with the Registrar of Public Assistance; either you work the institution under the restrictions proposed by the Dissentients and then its value is killed; or you work it under conditions of efficiency, and then you introduce the essence of the Majority's recommendations. Only, in the case of the Children's Care Committees, we have the right thing before us in its inception and working, and the question is if you are going to cut it down into the wrong thing. I will now make this good by citations from the history of the typical Care Committee, and from the accepted text-book which formulates the experience of its working. The school in question is referred to in the text-book as School X.

1. The Committee originated in a reaction against a wholesale feeding system and in favour of individual work at the homes:—

"In School X an organised system of free dinners had been established in January, 1890, and continued every winter down to Easter, 1898, when it was given up, having proved unsatisfactory in every way." ("Children's Care Committee," by Margaret Frere, p. 33.)

The Children's Committee was formed accordingly, home-visiting being the pivot of the system:—

"If these little Committees are worked properly, they will soon effect so great an improvement in the condition of the children that all the more ambitious and costly schemes of free-feeding might be dropped." ("Children's Committees in Public Elementary Schools," by Margaret Frere, 1907, pp. 4—8.)

2. The Committee introduced the methods of, and depended on co-operation with, a *general* system of Voluntary Aid, and also presupposes a system of Public Assistance:—

"I am often asked who helped me to carry out the Tower Street system, so I gladly take this opportunity of acknowledging most gratefully all I owe to the Charity Organization Society. Mr. Loch was the first person who showed any interest in my ideas on school-relief. I saw him once four years ago, and he gave me good advice and many valuable suggestions. In October, 1900, two workers came to help me from the C.O.S. District-Committee near the school: they did a great deal of the visiting and hammered out the principles on which to work our Relief-Committee. Nobody else ever took the slightest notice of what we were trying to do at Tower Street." (Report of the Tower Street School Relief Committee, 1903-4.)

(The C.O.S. had indeed suggested a similar system in their Report of 1893, on the Assistance of School Children, as a result of experiments initiated by a Committee which they appointed.)

"It is also important to make acquaintance with the numerous agencies occupied in different ways in looking after the well-being of the people resident within the area served by the school, such as the various religious bodies, the philanthropic Societies, the local authorities, the Boards of Guardians, with all of whom friendly relations should be maintained by the Care Committee workers in order to make their Committee a clearing house for distress." ("Children's Care Committees, 1909," Margaret Frere, p. 57.)

3. The training demanded by the work of Care Committees, and introduction to the co-operating agencies, are best to be obtained through Committees analogous to the Voluntary Aid Committee proposed by the Majority:—

"*Practical Work* under expert guidance can be obtained at any District Committee of the Charity Organisation Society. Managers can join one of these Committees for six months or longer, and learn, not "by making mistakes," but by doing the work in the right way from the very beginning. The training in business habits alone which the Charity Organisation Society worker gets, will be found of great service later on in the school, and should enable Managers to introduce method and principle into their Care Committee work.

While working in a Charity Organisation Society office Managers should attend, if possible, as part of the training, the meetings of a local Skilled Employment and Apprenticeship Committee, also the meetings of a Care Committee, home-visiting cases for both Committees under the direction of an experienced Visitor." ("Children's Care Committees," by Margaret Frere, pp. 56-7.)

A great part of the same argument would apply, I believe, to the health visitors. Specialist visitors must be in touch with and cannot by themselves supply a system of agencies dealing with the whole problem of necessitous cases.

5. We have been led into the province of charity, and much of what has just been said bears directly on the disparaging reflections embodied in the Separate Report with reference to organised charity. Putting aside, however, innuendos and caricatures, the question is this. Both reports agree that voluntary workers have an invaluable function to perform as visitors for a public authority, and that special institutions are well invented by charitable persons and carried on by voluntary funds. Both, however, are in agreement that public inspection of such institutions is desirable. But the Majority further desire that voluntary aid should be systematised outside the public assistance arrangements which are supported by public funds, and their proposals for Councils and Committees of Voluntary Aid are to this intent. Part VII. of the Majority's Report is an ample and able discussion of English, American, and Continental experience of this problem, on which very full evidence was heard and collected. This should be studied at least in the citations of Part VII. The Continental arrangements were also personally investigated by a group of the Commissioners. The Continental system is often, though not exclusively, that by which volunteers visit for the public authority,

using public funds. The English and American systems are based not on a plan of absorption but on one of division of labour, by which the organisation of voluntary aid is supplementary to the system of the State, and uses voluntary funds. It was the opinion of the Majority that the idea of cure and restoration was less effectively present in the Continental models, excellent and methodic as they are, than in the somewhat different system which has formed itself in English-speaking countries. One should bear in mind the immense work to be done in Great Britain, as mentioned above, in the rescue and application of dole charities, a work which has been very successfully initiated on the system which the Majority desire to promote. It should be clearly borne in mind (contrast separate Reports) that the rule against irresponsible almsgiving by visitors is absolute. The discussion and evidence of Part VII. bring out the nature of the proposed division of labour; and the characteristics which we have noted above, the method, enterprise and inventiveness of private charity, are shown to be a desirable supplement to the methods of State organisation. It is part of the problem from which we started, whether or no we are impressed by the work of the last fifty years in developing the voluntary side of the method of social therapeutics. The movement of that period in this direction seems too significant and too powerful to be turned back.

6. The fundamental conflict of ideas persists through the recommendations upon unemployment. Is it a condition continuous with, sliding into and out of, the other conditions of necessitousness; or is it a phenomenon wholly apart, and demanding a separate authority and wholly separate methods of treatment? There is a subtle agreement here between the two reports, within the fundamental antagonism. For each of them directs its consideration not to the unemployed *eo nomine*, but to the "able-bodied" as a whole. So that in the Majority Report the unemployed come within the scope of public assistance and voluntary aid as dealing with all and any necessitousness of the able-bodied; in the Separate Report all and any necessitousness of the able-bodied except sickness comes within the scope of a separate authority primarily constituted to deal with unemployment. It thus seems to be recognised that there is a continuity throughout the whole range of necessitousness and that one must admit that the treatment of the unemployed is not a subject by itself but forms one aspect of the general treatment of the able-bodied. It is needless to enlarge further on this conflict; it will be more useful in our few remaining words to compute the gains which both Reports allow us.

In a word, relief works are to go; all unemployment is to be

treated by graded institutional methods intended to be restorative, or by emigration. Labour exchanges are to be linked up with the institutional treatment, so that the latter will have a constant tendency to re-discharge into the labour market. Public efforts are to be made towards the decasualisation of labour, and the problem of school age and what comes after is to be taken up in earnest. A cry of Socialism has been raised against the proposals of the Separate Report, but I cannot see that on analysis this is strictly justified by the details of the suggestions. It might be supported, perhaps, by certain *obiter dicta* and large expressions as to the duty of the Labour Minister. While I believe that the problem cannot be treated in its causes except by skilled Public Assistance with very large powers, I think that acknowledgment is due to the Separate Report for the great advance over the policy of the Unemployed Workmen's Act embodied in its condemnation of relief works. There is, of course, the proposal for Government manipulation of the labour market on an enormous scale, and it may be said that the difference of degree between this and any ordinary foresight that a public-minded employer can exercise amounts to a difference of kind. The danger—a considerable danger—seems to me to be that the arrangement should work as it is not intended to work, and should be modified in practice towards the bad methods which it is meant to supersede.

It must be observed that if the unmeaning cry of "No charity" succeeds in defeating the Majority's proposal to call in systematise Voluntary Aid, the most honourable and appropriate mode of dealing with a first-class workman out of employment owing to exceptional causes will be destroyed. There can be no right in anyone to have more than the best the community can do for him, and the community can only do the best for him by making use of the organ most delicately adapted to his circumstances. No other agency could possibly deal with cases of this class so wholly without restrictions, which in such cases become unintelligent, as can expert Voluntary Aid Committees. No suggestion in the Separate Report even hints at a substitute for adaptive treatment of this type.

It is worth noting, in conclusion, that the comparatively small volumes of Evidence containing accounts of the personal visits of the Commissioners to institutions in England and Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, are extraordinarily well worth reading, and form almost a new departure in the procedure of Royal Commissions.

BERNARD BOSANQUET.

II. THE END OF THE POOR LAW.

To the sociological student Reports of Royal Commissions have a special significance. Even more than other intellectual manifestations, these deliberately framed surveys of social conditions and elaborately formulated proposals for changes of social tissue express to us something beyond the personal predilections of their signatories. The member of a Royal Commission, nominally free though he be to give what advice to the Crown that he chooses, inevitably finds his course shaped for him by factors outside his own volition. Struggle as he may, he is in the grip of forces which, though they do not wholly determine, yet powerfully affect his action. There is, first of all, the survey of fact: not necessarily complete, nor even scientifically adequate or impartial; but almost certainly more adequate and impartial than any individual investigation can secure. And this comprehensive survey of the facts, irrespective of individual bias, is peremptorily and authoritatively forced upon the attention. The member of a Royal Commission cannot easily ignore the facts that he does not like, or wholly slur over that part of the problem which is repugnant to his hypothesis or his prejudice; nor even unconsciously subordinate what he would prefer not to recognise—all of which things are besetting sins of the individual student, and the almost invariable roots of those prepossessions which the ordinary man regards as his opinions. And besides the survey of facts, there is the intangible yet potent force of the spirit of the age—the silent judgment of experience upon human life as a whole which tests all theories; the general conclusions, unformulated, unexpressed, and even unconscious of themselves, to which the common mass of men have come, if not on the actual problems submitted for solution, at least on the principles upon which to deal with these problems. In the grip of these forces, which manifest themselves in all the evidence, in the visits of inspection, in the arguments of other members of the Commission, in each Commissioner's own thoughts as he tries to write, in the very climate in which the Commission lives and moves and has its being, the

most prejudiced Commissioner finds himself unable to remain unaffected. The common judgment of such a body has therefore a value of its own. The conclusion may not be of perfect scientific accuracy. The proposals may not be quite adequate or quite practicable. But the Report has real sociological significance. It is at once a witness to the hitherto unformulated judgment of the community as a whole, and a powerful factor in making that judgment universal. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*.

Seen in this light the Report of the Poor Law Commission of 1909 has to the sociological student an importance of its own, transcending even its probable weight as an implement of reform. The eighteen Commissioners were selected and appointed by a Conservative Ministry and placed under the chairmanship of a statesman of Conservative prepossessions and opinions. Half a dozen of the members were themselves Poor Law Guardians, or had lately been such. Half a dozen were members of the Charity Organisation Society, among them being the devoted secretary of the society who has given his whole life to the formulation and dissemination of its well-known social doctrines. Four more were leading officials of the very department of the State, the Local Government Board, of which the administration had to be passed under review. An overwhelming majority of the Commissioners started, it is safe to say, either with a presumption in favour, generally, of the existing order, or with a belief that it ought to be improved on the lines of what had come to be accepted as Poor Law orthodoxy. Nevertheless, so potent has been the survey of facts to which the Commissioners found themselves driven, so irresistible the influence upon their minds of their three years' study, so subtly dynamic the spirit of the age, that the whole eighteen Commissioners have come to unanimous conclusions of the most far-reaching social importance. Probably not a single member of the Commission, at its starting, had any intention of coming to these conclusions, or even contemplated them as possible. This makes it, to the sociologist, all the more significant. For what the Royal Commission of 1905-9 has done, in its Majority Report no less than in that of the Minority, has been to destroy the much vaunted "Principles of 1834," to reveal the intellectual bankruptcy of the policy so long inculcated by the headquarters of the Charity Organisation Society, and to "smash, pulverise and destroy" the whole Poor Law system. It is a case of Messina after the earthquake, though happily the mortality is only among ideas. The Poor Law of 1834-1908 is to-day like a

plate which has been dropped on a stone floor. It is still there, and may for some time remain, but it is shattered to pieces.

This unanimous condemnation is all the more impressive in that there is a Minority Report as well as a Majority Report, with important differences as to constructive proposals, to which reference will later be made. But in their destructive criticism the eighteen Commissioners—Poor Law Guardians and Local Government Board officials, philanthropists and economists, Socialists and Individualists, Liberals and Conservatives, men and women alike—are unanimous and emphatic. All agree that the Boards of Guardians, taken as a whole, have failed in their task, and cannot but continue to fail, and must therefore be wholly and promptly abolished. All agree that the General Mixed Workhouse, the very keystone of the Poor Law structure erected after 1834, is, as a succession of critics have heretofore urged in vain, pernicious and demoralising, and must be wholly given up and done away with. All agree that the Union area, which has for seventy years dominated so much of English Local Government, must disappear from the map, and that the functions of the Guardians must pass to the County and County Borough area. All agree that the very conception of the Poor Law of 1834—that it was to be negative and not positive in its action; to confine itself to the mere relief of destitution under deterrent conditions, and to leave to private charity the more active assistance needed by particular cases—must be abandoned; and that the work of the State in the future must be throughout “curative and restorative.” To emphasize this break with the past, it is recommended that the whole terminology should be changed: there is to be no more Poor Relief and no more pauperism, but only the “public assistance” of the “necessitous.” Instead of the Overseers of the Poor of the seventeenth century, or the Governors and Directors of the Poor of the eighteenth, or the Guardians of the Poor of the nineteenth, we are (urge twelve out of the fourteen members of the Majority) to have a “Public Assistance Committee,” which, by the aid of a “Director of Public Assistance,” will, as part of the normal public functions of the County or County Borough Council, and at the cost of the ordinary County or Borough rate, provide whatever “public assistance” is required for the curative and restorative treatment of any “necessitous” person. And, most remarkable of all, there is, from beginning to end of a Report which runs to more than half a million words, and which surveys all Poor Law history and every phase of Poor Law policy,

no endorsement or ratification, and no reassertion, of the fundamental principles on which, with regard at any rate to the able-bodied, the authors of the 1834 Report laid so much stress: namely, that the condition of the person relieved must always be made less eligible than that of the lowest grade of independent labourer, and that Outdoor Relief should as quickly as possible be superseded by the offer of the Workhouse. On the contrary, the very notion of the "workhouse test" is abandoned, and express provision is made for the continuance, even to able-bodied men, of what is to be euphemistically termed "Home Assistance"; the Workhouse is actually to be abolished; and we are expressly told that the system of 1834 is out of date. "The administrators of the Poor Law," it is stated in the Majority Report, with regard actually to the able-bodied, without dissent by any one of its signatories, "are, in fact, endeavouring to apply the rigid system of 1834 to a condition of affairs which it was never intended to meet. What is wanted is not to abolish the Poor Law, but to widen, strengthen and humanize the Poor Law so as to make it respond to a more considerate, elastic and, as far as possible, curative treatment of the able-bodied."* It is, indeed, startling to be told, over the signatures of the official heads of the three Local Government Boards, of the Secretary and half a dozen members of the Charity Organisation Society, of three or four representatives of what has hitherto been the "strict school" of Poor Law Guardians, and of a Conservative statesman, that what we have got to do is actually to "widen" the Poor Law, as well as to transform it, as part of the normal functions of the County and County Borough, into an active philanthropic agency for the curative and restorative treatment of "the necessitous." And all this, far from being condemned by the *Spectator* and the *Charity Organisation Review*, or repudiated by the British Constitutional Association, has been, since the 18th of February, 1909, acclaimed and expounded with approval by these special defenders of the "principles of 1834," no less than by the rest of the press and the public. Consider the shattering effect of all this upon the 24,000 Poor Law Guardians, upon the minds of the Local Government Board Inspectors, upon their moral influence in advising refractory local authorities, upon the power of the Local Government Board itself. It will be impossible to urge any further expenditure on the most necessary buildings; it will be impossible to press

* Paragraph 337 of Chapter I of Part VI of Majority Report (page 366 of the Bluebook).

Guardians to "offer the House"; it will be impossible to criticise them for granting Outdoor Relief. All the floodgates are opened. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*

The Report of 1834 was the outcome of the spirit of the age. The "principles of 1834" embodied in its baldest form the doctrine of *Laisser faire*. They rested on what may be called an atomic conception of society. It is true that the community had, since Elizabethan days, undertaken to prevent actual death from starvation. But for anything beyond keeping the destitute applicant alive, the non-responsibility of the community could be assumed without question. The "principles of 1834" relied, for inducing the individual to support himself (and his family) by his independent exertion, on the pressure that results from a man's being, in the competitive struggle, simply "let alone." As the only alternative to self-support there was to be presented, uniformly throughout the country, the undeviating regimen of the workhouse, blankly negative and restrictive in its character, with conditions "less eligible" than those to which the unregulated competitive struggle reduced the lowest grade of independent labourer.

It is needless to inquire what would have happened if these "principles of 1834" had been carried out as their *doctrinaire* adherents—Harriet Martineau, for instance, or Nassau Senior—intended and desired. It is clear that hundreds of thousands of the children, the sick, and the aged would have died. But it was found, from the outset, by the Poor Law Commissioners equally with the Poor Law Guardians, quite impracticable to carry out the principles in their entirety. Very promptly we see the officials themselves—even Edwin Chadwick and Carlton Tufnell—starting an entirely different line of policy, which went on developing whilst the "principles of 1834" were being thrown more and more into the background, first with regard to the children, then with regard to the sick, then with regard to the mentally defective, the aged, and finally also the able-bodied men and women not at work and "unemployed." But these separate sections, taken together, make up the whole pauper host. Instead of restricting public action to the provision, under deterrent conditions, of the mere relief of destitution, we see the State taking upon itself, for one section after another, more and more of active interference with the environment of the individual; and creating for this purpose a whole series of special organs unconnected with the Poor Law. It seeks to prevent the occurrence of what is deemed

detrimental; it seeks to restrain the creation of circumstances adverse to individual development; it seeks to promote social conditions judged likely to result in favourable growth; and, seeing that otherwise many millions will be without them, it seeks to provide, for all, those means of sanitary living, education, and healthful recreation which seem indispensable to an efficient community. All this has developed, since 1834, to an enormous extent. It rests on the assumption that between the individual and the community there is a mutual obligation. The individual must do his part. But the State cannot with impunity neglect its own part. We have come to believe that the universal maintenance of any standard of civilised life cannot safely be left to individual self-interest. The universal maintenance of a definite minimum standard of civilisation, and the progressive elevation of that minimum is regarded as the joint responsibility of an indissoluble partnership. The community, far from washing its hands of the individual, finds itself forced, in the interest of the community as a whole, to assume definite duties with regard to him. It recognised these duties first in the cases of the children and the sick. It now recognises them with regard to the mentally defective and the aged. It is more and more coming to recognise them with regard to the adolescents of either sex, the feeble-minded and the prematurely invalidated. Since the Unemployed Workman Act of 1905 it has completed the whole series by deliberately recognising, though as yet only imperfectly fulfilling, its responsibility for the able-bodied unemployed. Thus, the Poor Law has virtually been superseded with regard to every one of the different sections that make up the pauper host.

Unfortunately, though the community has made these advances in thought, and translated them expensively into fact, it has never brought all its thinking or all its action into line. There are still well-meaning people, deeming themselves educated, who believe the "principles of 1834" to be still valid, and who think it vital that all those who fail to provide for themselves and their families without State aid should be marked out from the rest of the community; stigmatised as paupers, not out of harshness to them but in order to prevent a dangerous spreading of their social disease; and, above all, deprived of the Parliamentary franchise on the ground that a man who cannot provide for himself, and manage his own affairs without public assistance from the rates and taxes, ought not to vote for the legislature of the country. Such persons remain quite unaware of the extraordinarily large

amount of Public Assistance—often actually food—that now exists outside the Poor Law.

Owing largely to this confusion of thought, we have, in the course of the three-quarters of a century since 1834, got our various arrangements for public assistance into a mess. In 1834 we were spending seven millions on the maintenance, education, and medical treatment of the poorer classes, and the burden was thought so terrible that we have ever since been aghast at the peril from which the nation was rescued! To-day we are spending from rates and taxes on those same services, for a population only twice as large as in 1834, about seventy millions a year, or just ten times as much. And there is overlapping and confusion at all points. Every part of the Kingdom has its organisation for Poor Relief, providing, at a total expense of twenty millions a year, for those persons who are "destitute" of food, education, or medical care. But every part of the Kingdom now has other public authorities, providing out of the same fund of rates and taxes, without reference to the Poor Law Authorities, to the extent of no less than fifty millions sterling annually, food, education, and medical attendance for the several classes out of whom the pauper host is made up—in many cases providing simultaneously for the very same families. Thus, every district has its Poor Law provision, hospital and domiciliary, for the sick poor; at an expense of about five millions a year. But every district now has also its Public Health organisation, which treats, maintains, and cures hundreds of thousands of persons annually, and provides over 700 municipal hospitals, besides much domiciliary work, at an expense of six or seven millions sterling. It is often a mere chance whether a sick person becomes an inmate of a municipal, a Poor Law, or a voluntary hospital, and thus a pauper, an unpauperised municipal patient, or the recipient of private charity. At Bradford, the phthisis sanatorium is a Poor-Law institution; at Brighton it is a municipal service; in Scotland the Public Health Authorities now undertake, gratuitously, all cases of tuberculosis of every kind; in England this is still usually relegated to the Poor Law. Much the same may be said of the mentally defective. The Poor Law Authorities still provide for about 70,000, mostly in the workhouses. The County and County Borough Councils provide for about 120,000 more, but mostly as paupers. In Ireland the County and County Borough Councils provide for lunacy without any connection with the Poor Law. For children the overlapping and confusion is beyond belief. Three, and

sometimes four, public authorities are maintaining schools, and sometimes feeding children, without knowing even what each other is doing. In London, and many another town, a destitute child may be sent to one or other of four residential schools, all maintained out of the rates and taxes, and managed by rival and competing public authorities. The child living at home may be maintained at the cost of the Poor Rates, by the Poor Law Guardians (as 10,000 are in London); or may be fed at school at the cost of the Education Rate (as 53,000 are being fed in London alone). What is even more startling is to find that *in several thousand cases both authorities are maintaining the same children* unknown to each other. There are not a few families in which, at one and the same time, one child is being maintained in a reformatory school paid for by the Home Office, another in an industrial school paid for by the London County Council, another in one of the "barrack schools" of the Board of Guardians, whilst those left at home are being supported on Outdoor Relief, and at the same time are receiving dinners at school out of the Education Rate. *Such cases have been accidentally discovered*; and it is perhaps one advantage of the total lack of co-ordinating records that no means exist of knowing how many others there are! As to the able-bodied men, they are being maintained as vagrants in the Casual Wards, they are being maintained as able-bodied in the Workhouses, they are getting Outdoor Relief on the ground of "sudden or urgent necessity" (10,000 in a year); they are getting it by special sanction of the Local Government Board (20,000 to 30,000 in a year); they are getting relief in the Labour Yards whilst breaking stones; they are (in Ireland) employed on Poor-Law relief works at wages; they are (in great Britain) given employment at wages by Distress Committees of the Town Council. Thus, there is now overlapping at every point. Not one section of the pauper host—the mother in childbirth, the infant, the child of school age, the adolescent, the sick, the mentally defective, the aged, and the able-bodied in distress from unemployment—is the Poor Law Authority now left in undisputed possession of. For every one there has grown up since 1834 a new public authority, dealing with that particular section, not in respect of its destitution, but in respect of the cause or character of its distress. For each section there is duplication and overlapping. This is how the nation's expenditure on the maintenance, education, and medical attendance of the poorer classes has risen in 75 years from seven millions per annum to seventy. It is no

wonder that some general overhaul of the system was called for. It was high time.

The Majority of the Commissioners are, as we have seen, at one with the Minority, so far as destructive criticism is concerned. Indeed, their language with regard to the appalling defects of the existing system is sometimes even stronger and less measured than that of the Minority. All the Commissioners agree that the present Poor Law must be destroyed—lock, stock, and barrel. But in the proposals for reconstruction the two parties differ. It is obvious to all that there must be a new and larger area of administration—that of the County and County Borough. It is clear (to 16 out of 18) that this must be an adjunct of the existing County and County Borough Council. But, remarkable as it must seem, the Majority of the Commissioners do not face the facts as to duplication of services and overlapping of functions that the Reports bring out. They propose to get rid of neither the one nor the other. The Local Health Authority will go on with its provision for mothers and infants, for the ever-widening range of the infectious sick, and even for the hosts of phthisical patients. The Local Education Authority will go on providing its residential schools and day feeding schools, though it is somewhat weakly hoped that Parliament will “reconsider” (how likely!) its decision of three years ago to let the necessitous children be fed at school, and that of two years ago, allowing those who were found needing medical care to be properly attended to. The Home Office is to go on paying for Reformatory Schools. Meanwhile the old Poor Law Authority is to be revived under the name of the “Public Assistance Authority,” having exactly the functions of the Board of Guardians, except that it is to deal with the “necessitous” instead of with the “destitute”; and that it is not to confine itself to the relief of destitution, but is to provide for every class “curative and restorative” treatment according to its peculiar needs. That is to say, the duplication of services and overlapping of functions that now exists between the Poor Law Authority and all the newer specialised services is to remain unreformed, and is even to be aggravated by the proposed remarkable expansion of the new Public Assistance Authority! This does not promise any reduction of the present expenditure of seventy millions sterling annually, in which, it is clear, there is no small waste.

It seems impossible that, when the position is realised, the country will permit, or that any Minister can propose to allow,

such duplication of services and overlapping of functions—involving an expenditure to-day of 70 millions sterling annually—to continue, still less to be increased. Yet the Majority Report clearly involves this. The Majority of the Commissioners seem, in fact, to have cheated themselves with words. They declare with emphasis, and repeat with evident comfort, that there must be in each locality, “one and only one Authority” administering Public Assistance; but they take no steps to carry that comforting declaration into effect. They will not face the facts. But there is no way out. Either the Local Health Authorities, the Local Education Authorities, the Local Lunacy Authorities, the Local Unemployment Authorities and the Local Pension Authorities, who are all administering Public Assistance, and spending on it more than double what the Boards of Guardians spend, must be abolished, and their functions transferred to a reformed Poor Law Authority—it is interesting to notice that only one Commissioner, Dr. Downes, has the clear-sightedness and courage even to hint at this—or else the Poor Law Authority itself must be abolished, and the several remnants of its services, which the encroachments of the five other local authorities have left to it, must be severally merged in the various services of the very same nature which those local authorities are already managing for the population at large. This, briefly put, is the proposal of the Minority. The whole of the public provision that is made for maternity and for infants under school age is to be united under the Local Health Authority; the whole of the public provision that is made for the child of school age and the adolescent is to be united under the Local Education Authority; the whole of that for the sick and infirm under the Local Health Authority; the whole of that for mentally defective under the Local Lunacy Authority; the whole of that for the aged under the Local Pension Authority. These five local authorities are, in all the County Boroughs, already committees of the County Borough Council. The cases of London, the rural counties, the non-county boroughs and the larger urban districts are specifically provided for in detail. Instead of “one and only one Authority” in each locality for all Public Assistance, which the Majority would like, *but do not propose*, because it has become impossible, the Minority provide for there being, in fact, one Authority and one Authority only for the administration of Public Assistance *to each section of the community*. This does provide effectively against any duplication of services. No two authorities can possibly be dealing with the same section. And,

most important of all, provision is for the first time made also for the keeping in each area of a common register of all forms of Public Assistance given *to the members of each family* from any source whatsoever (including, as far as may be possible, also all organised charity); the appointment of a special local officer for this work (the Registrar of Public Assistance); and for the systematic co-ordination by him of the present overlapping of relief, and the systematic recovery by him of the contributions that now go uncollected. No such provision for co-ordination and recovery forms part of the Majority scheme, or would be possible under it. The choice, in brief, is between letting the duplication, overlapping, and confusion continue, and deliberately facing the facts with a plan calculated to reduce the chaos to order. The issue can hardly be doubtful. The only question is how soon will the country come to understand the position, and the Cabinet and Parliament carry so great a reform.

But apart from this contrast between the plans of the Majority and the Minority, there is a further point of capital importance from a political standpoint. The Majority propose that the action and the expenditure of their new Public Assistance Authorities shall be wholly free from electoral control. The complicated hierarchy of local communities, *which are to spend the County Rate*, are, in the first place, to be wholly nominated or co-opted bodies. They are, in the second place, expressly *not* to include even a bare majority of members of the County Council, and most of them are so devised that they can contain only one or two such members. The County Council, finally, though it must meet their bills, even for capital expenditure, and honour all their precepts on the County Rate, without limit or restriction, *is to have no power of control*. Its function is strictly limited to the one of nominating the top committee, and paying all the bills. It has not to sanction the expenditure; it cannot veto it; it cannot lay down a policy; it is not to make by-laws; it would be out of order for it even to discuss the proceedings of the intricate network of committees which are spending its money. These proposals have so far proved incredible to the reviewers of the Report. They have simply been unable to believe their eyes, or to believe that such an uncontrolled local autocracy of nominated and co-opted members could be intended. Such a constitution is, of course, at the beginning of the twentieth century politically impossible. No Minister would propose it to the House of Commons; nor would it live an hour in that assembly if proposed.

The constitution proposed by the Minority is simplicity itself. The very committees of the County and County Borough Councils, which are already administering the several services under the directions and subject to the complete control of the Council itself, will severally find their present functions enlarged. Instead of providing their services only for the population at large, they will henceforth provide those same services also for their own particular section of those who are now paupers. The Registrar of Public Assistance, whom the County or County Borough Council will itself appoint, will co-ordinate the work of the several committees. Only, the Minority regard it as essential that the whole of the able-bodied, whether vagrants, paupers, or unemployed, should be withdrawn from the sphere of the Local Authorities, and dealt with by a national department (which might be a Ministry of Labour) in the way now to be described.

The gravest of all the questions is, indeed, of just this provision for the able-bodied, with its three closely related branches of the growth of Vagrancy, the heaping up of able-bodied men in the Workhouses and the chronic and importunate distress from Unemployment. The Majority do not grapple with any one of these three sides of what is essentially one problem. They have no policy as to Vagrancy, except to go on alternately relieving and punishing the "casual" as we have done for three hundred years. They cannot even make up their minds whether he is to be dealt with by the "one and only one Authority" that they desiderate, or handed over to the Police and the Home Office—as, in fact, was the practice before 1834. They have no policy as to the able-bodied in the Workhouse, except that this place is to be henceforth called "an industrial institution," and apparently converted into a place for carrying on all sorts of trades, which experience has demonstrated to be the most costly of all failures. They have no policy with regard to Unemployment, except the suggestion of Labour Exchanges to tell the men where there is work (or no work?) to be got; and a vague hope that someone will devise a plan of insurance.

The Minority have, at any rate, here again faced the facts. They put forward deliberately worked out proposals (a) for so arranging the national demand for labour as to compensate, as far as may be practicable, without any new or additional expenditure, for the great cyclical fluctuations; (b) for so co-ordinating the different "seasonal" trades as to mitigate the seasonal fluctuations; (c) for "decasualising," by "dove-tailing" the existing

jobs, the huge army of casual labourers, which lies at the root of all our difficulties. But it will be necessary to arrange for the absorption in industry of the men who may be displaced by these readjustments; and with this object three urgently needed social reforms are demanded: (i) the enlargement of the school-time and industrial training-time of boys and girls, and the consequent withdrawal from industry of half this immature labour force; (ii) the reduction of the present excessive hours of railway, tramway, and omnibus workers; and (iii) such an increase of the allowances granted to widows with young children as will permit of their abstention from wage-earning, in order to look after their children. In these ways, as well as possibly by settlement in small holdings and emigration, provision can be made for the surplus. But there will still be some unemployed. For them, there should be—*not relief works of any sort*, though this intention is persistently ascribed to the Minority, by those who have not sufficient fairness even to read what they criticise—but first (x), an extension of Trade Union insurance, by the aid of Government grants, (y) maintenance under training, in suitable training establishments for all who find themselves in distress, and (z) detention colonies to which the wastrels can be committed by the magistrate. This bold and comprehensive scheme, elaborately worked out in detail, can hardly be dismissed as impossible. It will remain a standing challenge to Ministries. If they do not cope with the problem in some other way, it can only be anticipated that the carefully devised proposals of this Minority Report will more and more capture the imagination of the Trade Unions and the Labour Party.

SIDNEY WEBB.

RACE PROGRESS AND RACE DEGENERACY.*

It is unfortunately a fact that there still exist grave divergencies of opinion between experts on the question of heredity, which is, of course, at the root of the whole problem of race progress and degeneracy; and advantage is taken of these divergencies to neglect entirely even the recognised laws of the breeding of offspring. There exists no more imperative task than that of putting an end to this state of things, and bringing home to the masses the essential importance of a knowledge of the conditions under which healthy offspring are reared.

The celebrated theory of Weismann is too well known, at least in its main outlines, to need any elaborate description here. It will suffice to say that, according to Weismann, in every multi-cellular organism are contained two distinct substances—the germ-plasm, which is affected to the reproduction of the species, and which transmits itself from one generation to another; and the somato-plasm, which is affected to the needs of the individual life, and which is consumed by the ontogeny. The Protozoa (unicellular organisms) do not differentiate their organic substance into two kinds, the cell being capable, not only of maintaining individual life, but of securing the persistence of the species; certain cell-colonies of Algae ("Volvox") show us first a functional differentiation between the cells, some of these being exclusively adapted to the maintenance and repair of individual life, and others having the capacity of reproduction.

The germ-cell or hereditary substance of all multi-cellular organisms is composed of a number of Chromosomes or Idants (*i.e.*, groups of Ids), whose number varies according to the species, but is constant for each species. Each Id contains the sum total of the features, characteristics, and dispositions of the individual in the shape of a number of Determinants, and each group of Determinants stands in precise and well-defined relation to some hereditary variable part of the organism. The Determinants possess a well-defined structure, and are composed of a mass of differentiated Biophors, or elementary living particles, capable of growth and of reproduction by division.

The great central fact in Weismann's doctrine is thus the

* A Paper read before the Sociological Society, March 22, 1909.

distinction between Germ-Plasm (affected to the needs of the Species) and Somato-Plasm (affected to the needs of the Individual). The former is potentially immortal, and, while remaining *structurally* unaltered during the life of the individual, can be transmitted from one generation to another.¹

Once we come to the problem of the origin of variations, we find widely divergent opinions. On the one hand the prevailing medical view is that the germ-cells are capable of being modified by environmental influences, and that genetic variations (*i.e.*, the variations of species) are the result of such influences. It ensues that the germ-cells are highly susceptible to environmental change, and that they will vary in a favourable or in an unfavourable manner according as the environment is favourable or unfavourable. On the other hand the diametrically opposite view is taken by Dr. Archdall Reid, who is of opinion that the germ-plasm is very highly indifferent to the action of the environment, and "therefore that children are seldom affected by the influences to which their parents are exposed."² Dr. Reid even goes so far as to say that "we know that the offspring of diseased and intemperate people are often perfectly normal and robust." Diametrically opposite conclusions must be the result of such diametrically opposite premisses. The partisans of the first theory, who hold fast to the view that the germ-cells are very susceptible to environmental influences, demand the removal of any detrimental element in those influences, owing to the danger presented by the probability of germ infection. Dr. Archdall Reid, from the contrary point of view, believes the germ-cells to run practically no danger of infection as the result of detrimental environmental influences.

But this question as to the origin of variations involves other highly-important questions touching the welfare of the race. Obviously, if we hold the germ-plasm to be extremely susceptible to environmental influences, we must expect a race to grow strong

1. The very interesting theory of heredity propounded by Beard, is, as far as this fundamental point is concerned, in essential agreement with that of Weismann. According to Beard, the germ-cells are absolutely distinct from the organism, and are not derived from the latter but from a parental group of similarly distinct germ cells. (Dr. John Beard, *The Track of Heredity in Plants and Animals*, in *Transactions and Proceedings of the Botanical Society of Edinburgh*, January, 1902; also *The Morphological Continuity of Germ-Cells as the Basis of Heredity and Variation*, in *Review of Neurology and Psychiatry*, January, February, March, 1904; and numerous papers in *Anatomischer Anzeiger*, Bd. viii, 1892; and *Zoologische Jahrbücher*, Bd. xvi, 1902. An account of Beard's researches is withheld for lack of space.)

² *The Biological Foundations of Sociology*, p. 10.

and vigorous if placed amid favourable surroundings, *i.e.*, among surroundings that will benefit the germ-cells of its individuals; and, *vice-versa*, we must expect the race to degenerate if the surroundings are unfavourable. On the other hand, if the reaction of the environment on the germ-cells be slight, the shaping of that environment in a favourable sense ceases to be a matter of great moment. Nevertheless, those who adopt the latter view, and among them Dr. Archdall Reid, do none the less reckon the environments. But whereas the former view sees in a *favourable* environment the *conditio sine qua non* of race progress, the latter one sees such a condition realised by an *unfavourable* environment. In an environment which is unfavourable to individual development, they say, only those individuals who are stronger than the average can survive; the weaker will be unable to adapt themselves and will be eliminated; and it is incontestable that such a process, as regards the species as a whole, is a distinctly beneficent one. Amid favourable surroundings there is no scope for the action of natural selection, which ensures the survival of the fit and the elimination of the unfit. Under such conditions, all detrimental influences having been removed, the weak and ill-adapted can survive as easily as the strong; and the result will be the progressive degeneration of the whole race, in virtue of the law of panmixia.

This standpoint, which Dr. Archdall Reid especially has adopted, is hardly consistent, since, on the one hand, the germ-cells are declared insusceptible to environmental influences; and, on the other, the action of the latter is still admitted, since those individuals whose germ-cells are ill-adapted will be eliminated, while those whose germ-plasm is adapted will thrive. If, as Dr. Reid declares, the germ-cells are susceptible to environmental change only in the slightest degree, the nature of the environment should be indifferent.

To a certain extent both the views above described are correct. The germ-cells are certainly susceptible to certain environmental influences, but not to all; and we thoroughly agree with Dr. Archdall Reid when he maintains that a universally favourable environment cannot but have detrimental results for the species as a whole, since it checks the action of natural selection and admits of the survival of the unfit on the same terms as the fit.

In order to arrive at a proper understanding of the root-question as to how far the germ-plasm is susceptible to the environmental influences it is necessary for us to classify these. We

may distinguish four categories of influences which may be designated as environmental or exogenous, viz. :—

1. The influence of blows, wounds, and mutilations.
2. The influence of use and disuse.
3. The influence of climate and temperature.
4. The influences which react on the germ-plasm through the intermediary of the nutritive fluids of the organism :
(a) Food, (b) Pathogenic infection.

With regard to the first two categories, it is certain that their influence on the germ-plasm is absolutely *nil*. Experiments made by Weismann on no less than 22 successive generations of mice, in which the tail of both parents was in every case cut off, yielded an entirely negative result; not one of the 1,592 mice born in successive generations from mutilated parents bore a trace of this mutilation which had been inflicted on both parents, and the experiment may be considered as decisive as far as the transmission of somatic mutilations is concerned. As regards use and disuse, it is evident that the limbs, muscles, and organs of an individual will be developed and strengthened by constant use, as also the psychical faculties; but the attainments thus acquired are never transmitted by heredity. The effects of use and disuse are confined to the individual, and do not have the least influence on the germ-plasm.

This conclusion may perhaps be challenged by those who are aware of the researches made by Heymans and Wiersma in Holland, supported by over 3000 Dutch physicians, and extending over several decades. Heymans and Wiersma declare that psychical faculties developed by use are hereditary, and that mental capacity is generally inherited from the father, and not from the mother; further, such capacity is, in the great majority of cases, transmitted exclusively to the sons. Among all the cases of alleged transmission observed, only two per cent. are said not to come within the range of heredity. Nevertheless it seems that the investigators have here confounded the influence of heredity with that of the surroundings. The fact that a certain percentage of mathematicians should have sons who manifest a taste for mathematics, can be just as easily adduced in support of the view that the influence of family life and of education is the primary cause of the development of this taste. It is evident that a father will seek to bring up his son in that sphere of life in which he himself has lived, and will endeavour to impart to his offspring his own tastes and interests. On the other hand, the fact that but few daughters

manifest the capacity for abstract reasoning is explicable in the first place by the father interesting himself less in the education of his girls than of his boys; and, secondly, by the feminine brain being less adapted to this form of activity than the masculine one. Lastly the operations of this pretended "law" are far too variable in their nature for us to be able to admit its character as such. If the transmission of developed psychical faculties is a law of heredity, there is absolutely no valid reason for such a law manifesting itself only in a certain percentage of cases. If it be true that one mathematician begets another, there must be some certainty about it, for the characteristic of law is its unfailing certainty. But there is no certainty whatever, there is only arbitrary haphazard, if more than half the number of cases investigated yield no result; and this seems undoubtedly true of those studied by Heymans and Wiersma.¹ Even with regard to those cases in which the son shares the tastes of the father, the investigators themselves admit that 2 per cent. are not within the range of heredity, thereby allowing for the action of other factors, and so replacing the whole matter under discussion.

We may therefore exclude the purely somatic modifications effected by mutilations, use and disuse, from all influence on the germ-plasm. As regards the modifications effected by climate and temperature, are these susceptible of influencing the reproductive cells and so becoming "variations"? In some cases the reply must be affirmative, in others negative. In his celebrated experiments on *Oenothera Lamarckiana* De Vries found that a number of strongly marked variations suddenly manifested themselves in a number of individuals, and that these variations bred true—that is to say, the variants, when fertilised by their own pollen, brought forth the same variation in identical form. These "mutations" can only be due to the action of the climatic environment. The experiments of Weismann on *Polyommatus Phlaeus*, a butterfly of the family of *Lycænidae* show that temperature undoubtedly exerts a strong influence on the pupa. At a temperature of $+10^{\circ}\text{C}.$, he was able to produce the northern variety from the pupa developed from the egg of an individual of the southern variety; and at a temperature of $+38^{\circ}\text{C}.$, the contrary result was obtained, the southern variety being produced from the pupa of a northern egg. The experiments of Standfuss and Merrifield have shown that, by lowering the temperature to $-8^{\circ}\text{C}.$, it is

1. We have before us only a very brief summary of these investigations in the *Politisch-Anthropologischen Revue*, vii Jahrgang, No. 6, p. 327.

possible to obtain aberrations from the normal type in the case of species of *Vanessa*. On the other hand, Nägeli cultivated 2,500 varieties of *Hieracium* at Munich, and observed that in every case the characteristic modifications due to change of habitat reappeared afresh in each successive generation; but experiments showed that these modifications were never inherited, being simply acquired anew; and thus we see that the soma may be susceptible to climatic influences, without the germ-plasm being affected.

We may, therefore, say that the germ-plasm is capable of being affected by climate and temperature, but that it is less susceptible than the soma, and that every somatic modification due to these influences is not inherited.

We come next to the fourth category of external or exogenous influences, those which react on the germ-plasm through the intermediary of the nutritive fluids of the organism. This category we have divided into two sub-sections, *i.e.*, the influence of food, and the influence of pathogenic infection. We will first consider the influence of food.

Collignon has studied the population of the Limousin from an anthropological standpoint, and has shown that in no other part of France is the population so small of stature.¹ This characteristic is not attributable to racial influences, as several different races are mingled together on the same territory and are all of them of uniformly small stature, but to the combined influence of climate and food. Generation after generation has lived in a raw and unwholesome climate, on an essentially unfruitful soil, and withal in wretched hovels situated amid deep, narrow, and foggy valleys. Stagnant water and boiled chestnuts formed—or continue to form—the almost exclusive nourishment. Under conditions such as these it is scarcely surprising that the stature should be reduced, as of course no surplus energy could possibly be furnished for the purposes of growth; and we might expect the germ-plasm to have been affected by such unfavourable influences, so that smallness of stature would become an hereditary trait. Nevertheless, this is not so, seeing that, as Collignon points out, individuals born in that region, but withdrawn from it during early infancy and subjected, during childhood, to other influences, grow normally and reach the same average height as any other persons; whereas, on the other hand, individuals not born in the region but imported into it during infancy, and who pass through the period of growth amid

1. Collignon, *Anthropologie de la France*, in *Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, t. i. série 3, fascicule 3. 1894.

these unhealthy surroundings, are stunted in growth. These researches of Collignon show, on the one hand, that the arrest of growth is due to the influence of climate and food; and, on the other, that this somatic peculiarity, notwithstanding its persistency, has not affected the germ-cells, and is, consequently, not transmitted by heredity.

Other evidence tends to show likewise that differences in the quantity and quality of food absorbed affect the physical development of individuals, even to the extent of appearing to create well-marked racial variations. Professor Alfredo Niceforo has examined several thousands of school children at Lausanne, and also the skulls of one hundred peasants at Sepino, in Southern Italy.¹ Here are, briefly stated, some of the results arrived at by him: the height, at all ages, is greater among the well-to-do class than among the poor class (1 metre 680 for the former, on an average, 1m. 648 for the latter); the average weight of the well-to-do children examined at Lausanne is heavier than that of the poor children; the average strength and the average power of resistance to fatigue, both of these being measured by the dynamometer, are likewise superior among the well-to-do than among the poor. Several other characteristic traits were noticed by Niceforo, such as differences in the development of the perimeter of the thorax, in the probable weight of the brain, in the measurement of the cephalic index, in the breadth of the jaws, in the colouring of the eyes, etc.

Similarly Schwiening has observed a general progression in the average height of the recruits in all European countries where reliable statistical material is available.² In Germany, during the period 1894—1903 (Bavaria, Saxony, and Würtemberg are excepted), the number of small persons among the recruits has diminished, while that of tall persons has increased. In all European countries where sufficient data were to hand, Dr. Schwiening has remarked a similar tendency towards the diminution of the number of small recruits and the increase of the number of tall ones. Dr. Schwiening observes:—

“Es fehlt die sichere Kenntnis darüber, seit wann diese Wachstumstendenz begonnen hat, und welches die Gründe für die gleichmässige bei den verschiedenen Staaten nachweisbare Zunahme

¹ Niceforo, *Essai sur l'Anthropologie des Classes Pauvres*, in *Archives d'Anthropologie criminelle*, t. xxii, No. 161, pp. 297—317. 1907.

² *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 July, 1908. Schwiening's observations were first published in the *Deutsche Militärärztliche Zeitschrift*.

der Körpergrösse, wenigstens im militärpflichtigen Alter, sind. Vielleicht spielen bessere Ernährung im Säuglings-, Kindes- und Jünglingsalter und die besseren hygienischen Verhältnisse der letzten Jahrzehnte eine günstige Rolle."

It is, however, impossible to draw any definite conclusions from these remarkable studies. The probabilities certainly are in favour of the view that these modifications, due to differences in the quality and quantity of food absorbed, are not hereditary, but are simply acquired afresh by each successive generation. If we turn once more to the observations made by Collignon on the inhabitants of the Limousin, we find that any individual withdrawn from a given environment and placed in a different one, will develop traits adapted to the new environment; but the children of this individual, if they are replaced in the former surroundings, will once more develop the corresponding traits, similar to those exhibited by their father before his emigration. Such traits do not affect the germ-plasm. In an individual is stunted in growth, it is not because his parents were also stunted, but because he himself has received insufficient food to enable a reserve of energy to be set aside for the purposes of growth. Applying these consequences of Collignon's discoveries to the case of the recruits noticed by Schwiening, it is reasonable to infer that, if the average height of the European recruit has increased during the last fifteen years, this is due to the fact that the general conditions as regards food and lodging have been improved; but this improvement reacts on each successive generation subjected to its influence, and does not modify the composition of the germ-cells. In the same way, the differences between the poor and the well-to-do children observed by Niceforo are due to food differences, and differences in the way of living generally. But place a poor child, during the period of development, in different surroundings, and the chances are 99 to 1 that it will present all the characteristic physical traits of the well-to-do.

The probability that the germ-plasm is unaffected by influences of diet is greatly enhanced if we consider, as Schallmayer suggests, the case of the aristocracy of Europe.¹ Although, during several centuries, the aristocracy were subject to the most favourable environmental influences, the average height of its individual members is in no wise superior to that of any other class of the population. Did the quantity and quality of food affect the germ-cells, its

1. Schallmayer, *Eugenik, Lebenshaltung und Auslese*, in *Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft*, xi Jahrgang, Heft 7-8, pp. 458-489. 1908.

influence must inevitably have made itself felt during the course of successive centuries, and the average height of members of the aristocracy should be greater than that of the other classes; but, as we say, no such general difference exists.¹

The well-known and obvious fact that breeders are careful to feed their prize animals well does not in any way contradict the supposition that food influences do not affect the germ-plasm. Breeders feed a prize animal well because they evidently wish to get the utmost out of it; but there is absolutely no reason to suppose that, even if one of the parents were insufficiently fed, the progeny would on that account be of inferior value. Evidently if a person breeds animals, he will be careful to feed them well, for there would be no motive to induce him to do otherwise; but we must not, for this reason, suppose that the feeding is of primary importance in the process of breeding. What is of primary importance is that the organism should be capable of responding suitably to good feeding and favourable surroundings, not the nature or quantity of the food itself.

We may conclude this discussion by saying that, in the light of the evidence before us, there is no justification for the supposition that alimentary conditions influence the germ-plasm.

There remains, among the various exterior or exogenous influences to which organic life is exposed, the influence of a pathogenic infection of the organism. That not only microbic disease, but also certain toxic substances such as alcohol, can influence the germ-cells and modify the latter, is universally admitted. Nevertheless the range of hereditary influences is here also limited. By no means every microbic disease transmits itself hereditarily; on the contrary, the one case which seems definitely and indisputably ascertained is that of syphilis. Neither tuberculosis nor cancer appear to be hereditary in themselves. Such diseases do, however, *indirectly* react on the germ-plasm by weakening the constitution generally, and thus altering the composition of the organic fluids which nourish the germ-cells.

With regard to the consequences of hereditary syphilis, these are, or ought to be, well-known, after the researches of Fournier, Tarnowsky, and others have shown us beyond all dispute what

¹ Cf. also the observations of Weismann concerning the regression of the wings of worker ants, regression which is not due to food influences; and concerning blue-bottle maggots which he systematically underfed without either the ovaries or any of the organs of the progeny being thereby affected. (*Vorträge über Deszendenztheorie*, ii. 102ff. Erste Auflage.)

they are.¹ Alcohol likewise exercises an incomparably worse influence on race and society than on the individual, for its effects menace less the individual who is too fond of it than his descendants. Dr. Bayertal found that, among five children suffering from convulsions during the first year, three were the offspring of men who, far from being habitual drunkards, were classed as *Gewohnheitstrinker*; and the other two were conceived in a moment of inebriety.² Dr. Ford Robertson mentions several other cases in which the hereditary transmission of alcoholism is clearly proved.³

It is unnecessary to go further into this matter here. We will merely state our conclusion, namely, that certain microbic diseases and certain toxic substances, introduced into the organism from outside, are capable of influencing the germ-plasm, and are consequently factors of much importance in race degeneracy. But we must beware of hasty generalisations; and the question as to the hereditary nature of a given disease cannot be solved in the light of any general principle. Every case must be examined exclusively on its own merits, and examined carefully, since the entire social aspect of any disease changes radically, according as to whether its effects are restricted to the individual or communicate themselves to the descendant of that individual.

Insanity may be reckoned among the category of pathogenic infections of the organism. It is probable that insanity is toxic in its nature; and it is certain that alcohol is one of the main factors in its production. Insanity is probably caused by the presence in the blood, by which the brain is stimulated to activity, of some noxious agent by which the stimulation is rendered faulty in its character, so as to produce perversion of function, and, ultimately, structural alteration of the brain tissue. Now, as the blood conveys nutrition to the germ-cells, the latter will likewise be impaired by bad nutrition; and, if the toxic substance remains sufficiently long in the organism, the entire blood stream will be infected by it, and the germ-cells will eventually be soaked in poison.

1. Chatterton-Hill, *Heredity and Selection in Sociology*, London, 1907, pp. 288—308. ("Syphilis as a Social Factor.")

2. *Psychiatrisch-Neurologische Wochenschrift*, ix Jahrgang, No. 43-44. 1908.

3. *British Journal of Inebriety*, Vol. i, No. 4, pp. 247, 248. Another symptom of race degeneracy, the growing inability of women to suckle their children, is attributed by Professor von Bunge to alcoholism; von Bunge has studied the cases of some 2,700 families, and declares that the alcoholic infection of the father destroys the suckling capacity of the daughter. (See the summary of these researches in *Politisch-Anthropologischen Revue*, v Jahrgang, No. 10.)

The result of the above discussion has been to show that the life of the germ-cells is to a very large extent—much larger than is commonly believed—independent of that of the organism. The study of the influence of the environment on the germ-plasm confirms the teaching of Weismann and Beard and Nägeli as to the essential difference between the reproductive and the somatic cells. Blows and injuries, use and disuse, do not affect the former in the least. It is highly probable that food, clothing, and hygienic conditions generally; likewise only affect the body-cells. Climate and temperature may affect the germ-plasm, but they do not always do so, as the experiments of Nägeli on *Hieracium* clearly prove. Finally, pathogenic infection does *sometimes* react on the reproductive cells, but by no means necessarily, such direct reaction having, as yet, only been proved in extremely few cases, of which syphilis, alcoholism and insanity are the chief.

Once this fundamental fact of the large degree of independence enjoyed by the germ-plasm is firmly grasped, it is evident that our views concerning the great problem of race progress and race degeneracy cannot fail to be modified thereby. But before going into the question of the influence of the environment on race progress or degeneracy, we must consider briefly another factor which greatly affects the future of society—we mean the internal or endogenous factor of the constitution of the *race* itself. This is a most vital factor of racial biology, especially if we bear in mind that the surest means of improving the constitution of the race is not to suppress all possible perils in the social environment, but to proceed according to principles of selective breeding, *i.e.*, to restrict the fertility of the unfit and increase that of the fit.

We have only space to notice quite cursorily the statistics compiled by Riffel¹ concerning the influence of the age of parents (a) on the number of offspring (b) on the fitness of the offspring. Already Rubin and Westergaard had calculated the relation of age to the degree of fertility to be as follows²:—

Marriage Age of the Man.	Number of Children per Married Couple.
Less than 25 years.....	3'50
25—29 years	3'25
30—34 years	3'02
35—44 years	2'28
45—50 years	1'10

1. Cf. summary in *Politisch-Anthropologischen Revue*, vii Jahrgang, No. 5, pp. 264 ff.

2. *Statistik der Ehen auf Grund der sozialen Gliederung der Bevölkerung*, p. 95. Jena, 1890.

Riffel, confirming these figures, has arrived at a similar result, after an inquiry into 531 marriages:—

Marriage Age of the Man.	Average Number of Children born.		Number of unfit children born of unfit marriages.	
	When wife younger than husband.	When wife older than husband.	When wife younger than husband.	When wife older than husband.
22—25	5.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
26—29	5.2	4.4	4.7	4.9

We see from these figures that the total number of children born diminishes with the increase of age of the parents, while the number of unfit children increases.¹ Even if the parents themselves are unhealthy they are more capable of producing healthy offspring when they are young and in full possession of their strength than when they are older. *Thus the age of parents is a factor to be taken into consideration, alike from the point of view of the fertility of marriage and from that of the capacity for begetting healthy descendants*; and, consequently, the economic conditions of society may react indirectly on the fertility and on the biological constitution of the race, in so far as they tend to prevent early marriage and to favour later marriage.

1. The investigations of Kider, *Statistische Beiträge zur Beleuchtung der ehelichen Fruchtbarkeit*, (Christiania, 1903—05) fully confirm the above figures. Prof. von Borkiewicz observes also: "Es zeigt sich dass der Prozentsatz der kinderlosen Ehen in hohem Grade von dem Alter der Eheschliessenden abhängt . . . Wie man sieht, steigt der Prozentsatz der unfruchtbaren Ehen mit zunehmenden Heiratsalter der Frau." (*Die statistischen Generalisationen*, in *Rivista di Scienza*, vol. v, No. ix, pp. 102—121, 1909.)

G. CHATTERTON HILL.

(To be concluded.)

MUSIC AS A SOCIAL DISCIPLINE.

IN his book entitled "What is Good Music?" Mr. W. J. Henderson has remarked that "whether it be but ingenious arabesques of tones or the language of emotions too deep for words," music remains dead and entombed in the shrine of the printed page "till the Gabriels of art sound it in the trumpet tones of its own resurrection." The truth expressed in these rather bombastic phrases was better set forth some time ago in one of the reviews by a music lover who complained that young and gifted interpreters of music were cruelly neglected by the public. "Without them," she wrote, "music would remain a silent cipher and the world would be bereft of its most potent comfort."

The object of her paper was to suggest the formation of a special society for their encouragement. The scheme would receive ample support, she believed, because "every city contains a certain number of cultivated people who study art solely for their pleasure and to whom the use of their day is a matter of choice." These prosperous individuals were to take the young artists under their protection for two years, lend them money during that period if necessary, build a hall for giving them a hearing at concerts for which a good many cheap tickets would be issued "for musicians and other impecunious people," and finally send them out into the world stamped with the approval of the "distinguished musicians and cultured amateurs" who would form the membership of the association, and "whose standing ensured confidence in their judgment."

What calls for remark in this plan is the singular conception of "the world" which it sets forth. Whether intentionally or no it makes that ample domain a preserve from any rightful participation in which some infallible authority has excluded all who have any obligatory work in life. In musical circles, in which there is a certain tendency to the prevalence of the parochial mind, this view is very common, though it is not put into words, or even into thoughts. Without being aware of the fact the promoters of the newly founded and very promising Musical League, of which Sir Edward Elgar is President and Mr. Frederick Delius Vice-President, have made it quite a large part of the policy by which

they propose to improve music as a means of national recreation and education. In order to demonstrate the wherefore of this misconception and the reason why professional and amateur musicians alike are seldom conscious of the narrowness of their musical outlook, it is necessary to give some consideration to the opposite viewpoint, from which music is

"Common and beautiful as light and air."

There is no better exponent of this belief than M. Camille Bellaigue. In his opinion music is the most social and sociological of the arts. He remarks how it has always appealed the most strongly to apostles of the people who make social regeneration the object and hope of their lives. The people, he says, are by nature musicians. They are not architects or painters or sculptors. Music exists for the people, not the public, and the decadence of music means the triumph of materialism and the loss of social faith. Many a reader will recall how in his fascinating studies on the subject he pictures forth one after another saints, scholars, martyrs, patriots, warriors and other makers of history and arbiters of national destinies who have derived their inspirations from music and maintained their courage by means of it. In his refreshing pages we read of many a thinker and reformer, and many a man of action, who has found music both a rest and a call to work: of Luther attributing to it a moral power as great as, and even superior to, that of his Bible, and chasing away the devil, who was no musician, with voice or flute; of Mazzini in a season of deep depression rousing himself to renewed valour in the battle for freedom and humanity by writing a treatise on music, and the necessity of socialising music, not as a specialist primed with knowledge and learning, but as a patriot glowing with noble passion; of Lamennais finding some consolation in the Platonic perfection of musical ideas for the trouble he suffered through his love for his fellow creatures and of the truth; of Frederick the Great indefatigably learning the flute from early youth, in secret, to old age, amidst the applause of the privileged Quantz, building a palace of music, gathering round him the best composers and executants of the day, planning and founding an opera house, industriously composing marches and concertos, and sandwiching all these activities in between his campaigns and councils with unflagging and life-long zeal.

The question now arises, how is it, if the love of music is one of the master passions of humanity, that the concert halls are not

besieged by waiting crowds like those which line up in patient excitement outside the less edifying of the theatres? The answer is that professional musicians have neglected one simple psychological fact—that music of any complexity brings volumes of new impressions into the mind in such exceedingly rapid succession that it is impossible to take them all in at a first hearing. The problem of popularising music is simply that of inducing people to listen to it until they begin to feel the intense and unique pleasure which it gives. This process of education need by no means be long or tedious, like the induction into the mysteries of the other arts, for the majority of listeners enjoy some vague sense of its grandeur, beauty, and richness the first time they hear a highly organised musical composition. They very soon acquire an enthusiasm for any such work as Handel's *Messiah* or Bach's *Passion Music*, which they hear often enough to understand it. Contemporary composers make so little headway partly, at any rate, because the themes and harmonies they originate are seldom heard more than once or twice by the same set of lay hearers.

Much, of course, could be done in the schools to promote the love of music, but some change would first have to take place in the prevailing conception of the nature and uses of this youngest of the arts. In the present state of society it is for the most part a device for making those who are removed from the economic struggle attractive to those who are engaged in it. On this account it is that girls are generally taught music, while for boys it is considered rather an effeminate pursuit. As women emerge from the position of artificial dependence which they now hold the desire that beauty shall interpenetrate the lives of both men and women and be no longer a mere adornment will gain ground, and music will go through the same phases of development which have made all the other arts in their day nationally educative and universally significant. These flourished only as an idealisation of the working life of a whole people. In Italy, for example, as Mr. John Addington Symonds has pointed out, artists like Giotto and Raphael, Perugino and Botticelli kept a shop and were ranked as tradespeople; and the art workers of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, including Cellini, Brunelleschi, Orcagna, and Luca della Robbia, commonly began life as goldsmiths. Music itself, so far, has had a similar career. Johann Sebastian Bach, who was practically the founder of the art and science of music, was great because he was popular; and the part of his work which possesses the greatest vitality, his *Passion*

Music, was expressly designed, with the old German chorales worked into its very structure, as a kind of sacrament in which everyone could participate.

When it is once understood that music is a fundamental part of ordinary life and is not something added on to it, anyone who is described as musical will be, in nine cases out of ten, not a performer, but a listener, and the music teacher will be engaged, not so much in showing children how to play, as in giving simple expositions of musical form, with perhaps a few graphic and historical accounts of the composers and their times; and in pointing out the beauty of their works and playing these in sections and as a whole many times over. It is but few people who possess either the mind or the fingers which a good interpreter of music must needs possess, and the pitiful piano drummings and violin scrapings that now do duty as music dull instead of training the ear. It augurs ill for the future of the art in England that these dreary bunglings have now become fashionable in the Council Schools as well as in the more genteel educational establishments. From this point of view Mr. H. G. Wells has some justification in calling music the most detached of the arts and the most accessory of attainments. His proposal that the piano should be banished from the schools in favour of some such meaner instrument as the spinet may be put down to what he hyperbolically describes as his "special, profound, and distinguished ignorance" of the subject.

But there is no need to wait for the growing up of a generation trained in the love of music to make this passion both intense and widespread. There is already a vast public in whom a taste for music has been awakened to a keen hunger which they have no chance of satisfying. The traditional concerts do not help them, for the reason that these are usually held only in the best quarters of the largest cities, and further that they produce only a series of dreamy, mystic, fleeting sensations that are not satisfying to those to whom loose thinking and unthorough reasoning are painful. In a scientific age, of course, this type of mind is very common. Musicians could easily meet the musical needs of such people by giving piano and quartette performances in private houses and very small concert rooms by way of preparation for the enjoyment of the varied concert programmes that are so bewildering on a first acquaintance, even to those who have studied music with some thoroughness. This mode of learning would not necessarily be expensive, for the small circle would pay only for the music. The fees which good

executants now receive are paid not so much for that as for the very high-priced operations of managers and agents, for the gorgeous decorations of the concert hall, for the hideous white and black suit, or the bare neck and satin robe as the case may be, which constitute a becoming platform appearance, and for the style of living and the kind of company by which this garb is necessitated. Circles that were too poor to engage a performer of many years' experience could employ some of the more promising students, who would be only too glad of some work other than the thankless and unmusical drudgery of teaching to help them through their training. Instead of getting hold only of a few striking melodies in a great composition, listeners who were thus prepared for orchestral music could come to know it as a whole, for they could ask the pianist to repeat over and over again the bridge passages and other parts of the music which it is difficult to grasp and remember.

A somewhat similar system of pleasurable education has been very successfully carried out by Mr. T. Whitney Surette in connection with that most public-spirited body, the Ancoats Brotherhood. His experiment consisted of a course of illustrated lectures on Beethoven's nine symphonies in which he explained the structure of these great creations and showed that so far from being a mere succession of notes calculated to make isolated and meaningless impressions on the mind, they were each a well-reasoned piece of intellectual work and at the same time a record of the deepest and the most intimate human passions. Each lecture was followed, two or three weeks afterwards, by the performance of the symphony it concerned by the Hallé Band.

It is doubtful, however, if analysis and lessons on musical form are a substantial aid to the appreciation of music. Probably these methods receive high praise in the very few cases in which they have been tried only because each hearer thereby obtains just a glimpse into the glories of some piece of good music which before he found incomprehensible. It is a question whether this much understanding is not simply the result of the repetition of certain passages which the lecturing necessitates rather than of the exposition in which it consists, and whether listening to music is not a synthetic pleasure that specific analysis to some extent spoils, just as grammatical interruptions take the keen edge off one's enjoyment of a literary classic. A few enterprising lecturers working up and down the country on the lines adopted by Mr. Surette, but without making his mistakes, could inaugurate a new

education which would lead to a music renaissance. Under such conditions the new Musical League would have ten times more success than it can ever command by supplying the wants of the existing musical public; and music would soon be, not a luxury spasmodically indulged in by the rich at fancy prices and controlled by commercial middlemen, but a national and international art industry for the products of which there was a steady and vitalising popular demand that would lead to the formation of municipal orchestras and the erection of public buildings for their accommodation. Here whole townful of people could enjoy real music that would be a socialising bond equal in strength to that of religious communities and family groups; and eager interest would be manifested in the festivals which the Musical League propose to hold, like that which made it a delight to the Athenians to spend whole days in the theatre for a week and more at a stretch, witnessing the dramas that expressed their democratic spirit and embodied their political and religious life.

Some such function music ought to be fulfilling to-day, for it affords the most refreshing rest from our keen economic struggle for life that has yet been devised. It is a great strain upon the attention, but that strain is of a totally different kind from that which results from the wearing effort to meet the constant demands of modern science, industry, and business. The more mechanical a man's work is and the stronger his reasoning powers are the greater his need for music becomes. It is noticeable that both singing and playing are the most popular, as in America and the North of England, where the industrial system has attained its firmest growth, that mathematicians and physicists are among the best musicians, and that some of the finest concerts in London are supported by the Stock Exchange.

A great future is before the musical profession if they will but minister to the million. Their goodwill would enable British composers to produce work as grand in its own way as that of the great romantics of Germany. The academic conditions for composing such work have already been realised, for the number of composers who write music of a high quality is large and increasing, and only some great national inspiration is needed to turn the musical talent of the country into genius. At once the most intellectual and the most emotional, the most universal and the most personal of the arts, music is indeed the most potent of all consolations for the troubles of workaday existence. But "the world" has never so much as tasted its delights. Wasted and

forgotten, these are entombed only too securely in acres of pages that no one but the professional musician ever turns, pages in which far more precious things are hidden than those the needless and irreparable loss of which has aroused such a passion of regret in the numerous generations of poetry lovers who have read how

“ Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.”

As liberalism, socialism, democratic sentiment and the women's franchise movement have proved in turn, the mind is capable of infinite expansion, and with every conquest of new freedom fresh wants arise and become pressing. Hence the strong human desire to neglect no source of knowledge or opportunity of enjoyment, and to turn everything to account and substitute order and economy for the chaos and aimless prodigality of nature. It is one of the saddest of social facts that music, which makes this dreary outer region less fearful and more homelike, should be dead and useless. Music, because it is almost purely subjective, represents the subdual of sorrow by joy, which is much nearer the heart of humanity than suffering and betokens more of the achievement of man and less of the tyranny of nature. The motto *res severa est verum gaudium*, which adorned the frieze of the Leipzig Gewandhaus, the scene of Mendelssohn's earliest and of his most devoted public labours, summed up with singular nicety the significance of that great composer's life and the uses that music serves in the social economy. It is joy and the discipline of joy by which the humanitarian sentiment of the twentieth century would regenerate society. Education and religion are no longer cruel, and soon even law and government will be humane also; and the process will be hastened by the reign of joy and music, which are social, while sorrow and pain are unsocial.

M. E. ROBINSON.

WAS GREEK CIVILIZATION BASED ON SLAVE LABOUR.*

II.

IN a previous article we proceeded by a hypothetical method. We assumed slave-masters, chattels, and apprentices as influenced entirely or mainly by economic motives, and endeavoured to work out a theory of Greek slavery on this basis. We did not discover, that is, what the condition of Greek City State slaves actually was, but what it was always tending and trying to be, what it would have been if the Greeks and their slaves had not been open to other than economic influences. It was necessary to make this assumption in order to secure a foundation to build on; and it was necessary to emphasize (and even exaggerate) the distinction between chattels and apprentices.

But it must not be assumed that, in actual fact, there was a chasm between these two classes, or that every apprentice slave was actually working under the stimulus of an offer of freedom.

There is one region of slave work in particular, where the theory can only be applied with great reservations—the household. In speaking of slave masters, chattels, and apprentices, theory tends to assume the chattels working in mines and quarries, the apprentices in manufacturing workshops, and the masters as modern business men. In the household, all these sharp distinctions are blurred, and economic motive is overlaid by a variety of other more comfortable influences. In Homeric days, before trade and manufacture were dissociated from household work, all slaves were household slaves, and large parts of our theory would not apply at all. Eumaios and Eurycleia would not be stimulated by the offer of freedom or the prospect of ending their days as unencumbered as the beggar Iros or the vagrant Odysseus. And the patriarchal household lingered on, of course, into the days of the full-fledged City-State, retaining many of its old economic traditions. We have the figure of the slave Paidogogos to remind us, firstly, that masters did not always get rid of their household slaves when they were past active work, and secondly that such slaves were often as contented to die in captivity as to die free.

* Conclusion of a paper read before the Sociological Society on November 9th, 1908.

forgotten, these are entombed only too securely in acres of pages that no one but the professional musician ever turns, pages in which far more precious things are hidden than those the needless and irreparable loss of which has aroused such a passion of regret in the numerous generations of poetry lovers who have read how

" Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

As liberalism, socialism, democratic sentiment and the women's franchise movement have proved in turn, the mind is capable of infinite expansion, and with every conquest of new freedom fresh wants arise and become pressing. Hence the strong human desire to neglect no source of knowledge or opportunity of enjoyment, and to turn everything to account and substitute order and economy for the chaos and aimless prodigality of nature. It is one of the saddest of social facts that music, which makes this dreary outer region less fearful and more homelike, should be dead and useless. Music, because it is almost purely subjective, represents the subdual of sorrow by joy, which is much nearer the heart of humanity than suffering and betokens more of the achievement of man and less of the tyranny of nature. The motto *res severa est verum gaudium*, which adorned the frieze of the Leipzig Gewandhaus, the scene of Mendelssohn's earliest and of his most devoted public labours, summed up with singular nicety the significance of that great composer's life and the uses that music serves in the social economy. It is joy and the discipline of joy by which the humanitarian sentiment of the twentieth century would regenerate society. Education and religion are no longer cruel, and soon even law and government will be humane also; and the process will be hastened by the reign of joy and music, which are social, while sorrow and pain are unsocial.

M. E. ROBINSON.

WAS GREEK CIVILIZATION BASED ON SLAVE LABOUR.*

II.

In a previous article we proceeded by a hypothetical method. We assumed slave-masters, chattels, and apprentices as influenced entirely or mainly by economic motives, and endeavoured to work out a theory of Greek slavery on this basis. We did not discover, that is, what the condition of Greek City State slaves actually was, but what it was always tending and trying to be, what it would have been if the Greeks and their slaves had not been open to other than economic influences. It was necessary to make this assumption in order to secure a foundation to build on; and it was necessary to emphasize (and even exaggerate) the distinction between chattels and apprentices.

But it must not be assumed that, in actual fact, there was a chasm between these two classes, or that every apprentice slave was actually working under the stimulus of an offer of freedom.

There is one region of slave work in particular, where the theory can only be applied with great reservations—the household. In speaking of slave masters, chattels, and apprentices, theory tends to assume the chattels working in mines and quarries, the apprentices in manufacturing workshops, and the masters as modern business men. In the household, all these sharp distinctions are blurred, and economic motive is overlaid by a variety of other more comfortable influences. In Homeric days, before trade and manufacture were dissociated from household work, all slaves were household slaves, and large parts of our theory would not apply at all. Eumaios and Eurycleia would not be stimulated by the offer of freedom or the prospect of ending their days as unencumbered as the beggar Iros or the vagrant Odysseus. And the patriarchal household lingered on, of course, into the days of the full-fledged City-State, retaining many of its old economic traditions. We have the figure of the slave Paidagogos to remind us, firstly, that masters did not always get rid of their household slaves when they were past active work, and secondly that such slaves were often as contented to die in captivity as to die free.

* Conclusion of a paper read before the Sociological Society on November 9th, 1908.

Moreover the household, with the variety of tasks which it provided, was a ground on which apprentices and chattels could meet and work together. We can see from our authorities how some large households consisted mainly of chattels and drudges and others mainly of apprentices, and how, by skilful and considerate treatment, a clever householder could turn one into the other and so increase the value of his property. We are told this by Xenophon and again by Plato,* in one of the many passages in which ancient writers seem to apprehend the distinction between the two classes of slaves: "Different persons have got these two different notions of slaves in their minds. Some of them utterly distrust their servants, and, as if they were wild beasts, chastise them with goads and whips and make their souls three times, or rather many times as slavish as they were before; and others do just the opposite." Here we have the clash between two contending economic motives, that of the plantation slave-driver who trusts only to physical compulsion, and that of the apprentice-master, who relies on skill and persuasion. Thus it can be seen that, in spite of cross currents, our analysis is not without value even for the household: and in proportion as the household merges, as in the City State life it always tended to merge, into a farm or a shop or a manufactory, it can be applied with increasing security.

There is another region of servile labour in which our conclusions may seem not to apply, that of serfdom. Where do the Helots find a place in our analysis? Are they chattels or apprentices? For our theory will hardly allow them to be a cross between the two. Have they a motive for their labour or have they not?

This raises some interesting questions. The Helots, of course, were not the only serfs in the Greek world. They were the most conspicuous; but they were only the survivors, and not the sole survivors, of a widespread system of servile labour on the land. In the period of fully developed City-State activity there were serf systems in Thessaly and Argos in mainland Greece, while it seems to have been a common way of getting agricultural labour done in the colonies which had a hinterland of docile barbarians. Our evidence about Greek Colonial communities is very scanty, but we hear of systems of colonial serfdom at Byzantium, Syracuse, Cyrene, more doubtfully at Epidamnus, and above all at Heraclea on the Black Sea, a prosperous agricultural community

* Laws 777A, cf. Xen Oec iii, 4 (et passim).

from which Aristotle drew many hints for his ideal City-State. Moreover, most important of all, the wisest political head among the 4th century Athenians, Isocrates, mapping out the conquests of Alexander half a century before they took place, urges the Greeks to undertake an Asiatic expedition with the deliberate policy, apparently, of establishing Greek colonial communities on a basis of serfdom.* In Greece proper the evidence shows that the system of serfdom originally existed in a number of places from which it had disappeared before the 5th century—at Epidaurus, Sicyon, Corinth, Delphi and Heraclea in Trachis. We have then to deal with a system which worked well, or at least well enough to justify imitation, in the Greek colonies, but found a difficulty in maintaining itself in the mother country, where the serfs were Greek and were more or less homogeneous with their masters.

Was the serf a chattel or an apprentice? He was certainly not a chattel: for he worked without supervision, and he could not be sold out of the country. Serfs were always recognized by the ancients as being in a different status from ordinary bought slaves, and they bore a distinctive name in every locality. Nor was he a free labourer, for his liberty was seriously curtailed. What was he then? Not a free man, nor a piece of movable property, but a piece of fixed property, a *fixture* like the soil he tilled. The serf system existed in communities which wished to have their agricultural work done for them by slaves (as it is often done in tropical countries) but had discovered that agricultural labour is too highly skilled and too difficult to supervise to be undertaken by chattels. They therefore adopted a system by which the labourer was kept to his work, not by his master, but by the law. But they were driven to provide him further with a motive for working efficiently. That motive is provided by allowing the serf to retain a certain proportion of his labour, or rather of the produce he raises. In other words, serfs are apprentice-slaves working with a peculiar and specialized motive. This motive was probably sufficient to maintain the system with tolerable success amongst unambitious barbarians in the colonies; for the Greeks did not settle except where the natives were tractable, and the barbarians probably gained in security, and in other ways, as much as they lost in freedom by contact with their masters. The gradual diffusion of Hellenic customs and ideas among these apprentice serfs would indeed form a fascinating subject of study. But among the mainland Greeks the system was less successful; for Greeks did

* Paneg: 131.

not acquiesce in being enslaved to Greeks and the motive offered them was not adequate to turn them into apprentices. Hence we find that serfdom in Greece proper tended either to disappear altogether, or to relapse into the barbarous atmosphere of chattel-slavery. No doubt Spartans ruled their Helots, as the Athenian slave-masters ruled their apprentices, by suppressing all attempts at organization, crushing their corporate spirit and holding out to individuals the prospect of earning their freedom by some conspicuous act of service. But side by side with these features of apprentice-slavery, Sparta presents many of the features of the typical chattel-slave state—the dependence on a single industry (in this case agriculture), the small number of slave-masters with an increasing population of “mean whites,” and a perpetual condition of social unrest and imminent civil war. In one respect Sparta fared even worse than an ordinary slave state; for, as her masters did not live together with the serfs, it was impossible to control their rate of increase, and wholesale massacres of grown Helots had to be resorted to in order to keep their population within the limits of subsistence and control. It is true that, as one writer observes, “the Spartans did their killing by night”; but when 2,000 had to be killed at a time,* the deed cannot have passed unnoticed. The other Greek serf-states, Argos, Thessaly and Crete, were faced with the same dilemma, but in a less acute and urgent form. Thus it may be said that among Greeks, serfdom falls under the head of chattel-slavery, and the states which are dependent upon it for the whole or the greater part of their labour are Slave-States in Cairnes’ sense of the term, while among the barbarians it falls under the head of apprentice-slavery.

Let us now turn from theory to history and seek to verify or at least to illustrate our results from the texts, and thus to arrive at certain historical, as opposed to purely hypothetical, conclusions.

What do the texts tell us about the occupations in which slaves were employed, and the conditions under which they worked? We find them engaged in practically every form of regular activity which the City-State world provided, from the most skilled to the most degrading. We find them in the arts and sciences, in trade and manufacture, in agriculture and mining; as doctors, teachers, innkeepers, retail dealers of every kind, domestic servants, secretaries, policemen, prostitutes, confidants, and favourites.¹ We

* Thucydides : iv, 80.

1. Calderini : *la mano missionaria e la condizione dei liberti in Orecia*, pp. 350 ff, has an exhaustive list of the professions in which the inscriptions reveal freedmen, but for the above list I have followed literary evidence only.

find every variety of price set upon their services, and we find them exposed to every variety of treatment. It is just this diversity in the evidence which has caused so much confusion in its interpretation and given birth to so many theories.

But there is one clear distinction to be drawn. There are some occupations in which we find both slaves and free people engaged, and others in which there is no evidence of free labour at all. And, fortunately, there are in each of these classes forms of employment about which the evidence, if not complete, is at least fairly precise and intelligible. There is the case of the mining industry on the one hand, as a purely slave occupation; while, on the other hand, there is building, as an occupation in which slaves and free men work side by side, and prostitution, as an occupation in which slave women and free women were both engaged. Other occupations, such as teaching, shop-keeping, banking, and medicine could be instanced: but about these our evidence is more fragmentary in character.

The best and simplest course will be to take one form of employment out of each of these classes and examine into its conditions in detail. In the absence of fuller evidence they must be regarded as typical cases of chattel slave and apprentice slave occupations.

Female employment raises large and difficult questions. I will therefore leave aside the question of prostitution, merely emphasizing the fact that, as Thucydides hints in the Funeral Speech, it was one of the few recognized ways in which a Greek woman could earn a livelihood, and that it was an employment which, as is evident from Plato's catalogue in the *Republic*, occupied a relatively far more prominent position than it occupies to-day. We may mention in passing the story of the career of Rhodopis in Herodotus (ii, 135) and the account of a similar career in Demosthenes' speech against Neaera. In both these cases the women are apprentice-slaves who earn their freedom, and their occupation is described, with the usual Greek directness, as a form of regular employment (*ἐργασία*).

Passing to our other two instances, let us take mining first. There is no need to be lengthy; for the evidence has been admirably put together by Ardaillon both in his book on the Laurion mines, and in an article on Mines in the French dictionary of antiquities; and it has further been well summarized for English readers by

Mr. Paterson.¹ The industry at Laurion (for the greater part of our evidence is about Laurion) consisted of two parts, the extraction of the ore and its carrying, crushing, and grinding above ground. We find cases of free men engaged above ground, but no case is known (and there is no reason for suspecting any) of free labour in the mines themselves. The work was carried on either in shafts and pits or in galleries. Some 2,000 shafts and 80—100 miles of galleries have been discovered. The shafts are generally deep, in some cases as deep as 250 feet; the sides are smooth and almost vertical, with ledges for ladders, and Ardaillon calculates that with two workmen to each shaft, they would be dug out at a rate of 16 feet per month. But most of the work was done in galleries. These galleries were winding, following the vein of the ore, and were kept very narrow, partly to save the trouble of propping, partly to obtain quick results. They are generally 2-3 feet high and 2-3 feet broad. As the galleries were quite dark the miners worked with small clay lamps, for which niches were made in the rock; these remained alight for ten hours and almost certainly marked the length of the daily shift. It is calculated that a workman could dig out about 12 yards of rock in a month of daily shifts. They worked in chains and almost naked, and were branded with their master's stamp. Ventilation was provided by occasional airshafts. All the authorities agree that the work went on without interruption night and day.

The numbers employed cannot be fixed with certainty; but since at the present day with modern machinery to keep down the numbers, the district employs some 11,000 men, Ardaillon believes that some 20,000 slaves must have been employed during the most prosperous period in the 5th century. As regards prices, the author of the *De Vectigalibus* calculates that mine-slaves could be bought at 158 drachmae each, and Demosthenes (Speech 37) speaks of a transaction in which mine-slaves fetch 150 drachmae each. This may be accepted as a normal price for the middle of the 4th century, and would be equivalent (making allowance for the rise in prices) to rather over 100 drachmae in the closing quarter of the 5th century. Domestic and other slaves seem to have fetched from 160—200 drachmae during this later period. Mine slaves, therefore, had a distinctly

1. Ardaillon: *Les Mines du Laurion dans l'antiquité*, Paris, 1897: Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités s. v. Metalla*: W. R. Paterson, *The Nemesis of Nations*, p. 190. For other accounts of ancient mining see Diodorus iii, 13-14, v. 36-38, which attracted the attention of Marx (*Capital*, English translation, p. 219), who detected how rare such conditions were in antiquity.

inferior market value. But all calculations of slave prices, based as they are upon statements which have accidentally come down to us, must be received with great caution; because the slave market was replenished mainly by warfare and raiding, and the supply of slaves was therefore subject to violent oscillations.

It can be seen from this account how closely ancient mining corresponded to the conditions laid down for a successful system of chattel slavery. The work is mechanical, unchanging, practically inexhaustible, and entirely unskilled; the workers are almost stationary in their places and can be chained without interfering with their efficiency; they work with only the roughest tools and appliances; the work does not involve disease but is yet sufficiently exhausting to lower the vitality and bring on an early death; it is carried on in a number of separate pits and galleries underground, under conditions where the amount of work performed can easily be measured and tested, and where the task of supervision is extraordinarily simple and inexpensive. The overseer (generally a trusted apprentice slave) could probably look after the entire property of a considerable mine-owner or concessionaire.* Above all, it is expended in production of silver, almost the only article for which there can be said to have been an international market and an unlimited demand.

Mining may therefore be taken as the typical industry for the employment of chattel slaves. Of course it was not the only industry; we hear of chattel slaves working in chains at quarrying and building and even (in Roman times) as fieldworkers and household drudges. But their supervision is always awkward and tends to be dangerous. Sometimes the difficulty is evaded by mutilation and disablement. Roman nobles cut out the tongues of their door porters, and the Scythians blinded the slaves who helped in the butter-making. But a pastoral community can make little use of male prisoners; and in a later chapter of the same book Herodotus tells us that the Scythians, even when not cannibals, found the skins and skulls of their captives more useful than their labour.*

Let us now pass to a typical apprentice industry, that of

* Nicias paid one talent for a skilled overseer (Xen: *de Vect* iv, 23). He would hardly have paid so large a sum if he needed several.

* See Hdt. iv, 2, 64, 76, 106. For the Roman chattels, see Cato, *de Agricultura*, and Columella, *de Re Rustica*; they work in chains (*vincti*) and are sharply distinguished from the 'soluti.' One of the duties of Columella's bailiff is to call names: 'mancia vincla, quae sunt ergastuli, per nomina cotidie citare debebit, atque explorare si sint compedibus diligenter innexia.' (xi, i, 22.)

building. We know from the historians, above all from the well-known passage in Plutarch's life of Pericles (chapter 12) that building was a free man's industry and that the big state buildings at Athens were partly undertaken to give the citizens employment. Fortunately we have a number of inscriptions dealing with buildings which provide us with exact details about work and wages.

As I am only using these inscriptions for purposes of illustration, I will briefly summarize their results without stopping to discuss the number of detailed questions which they open up. Most of these moreover have already been well set forth by Francotte. The survival of an inscription or a series of inscriptions is always, from our point of view, a matter of accident; and we should not be justified in compiling a monograph on the building trade in Attica out of the fragmentary temple-accounts which the archæologists have succeeded in unearthing for our enlightenment. But, with due caution, they may, I think, be used to suggest and to illustrate trains of economic reasoning.

An analysis of the wages bill for the buildings of the Erechtheum in 409 shows that wages were paid by the State for the work of 27 citizens, 40 metics, and 15 slaves. We are enabled to set side by side with this two other sets of accounts, referring to the building of a sanctuary at Eleusis in the years 329-8 and 319-8. These two sets, when put together, show 36 citizens, 39 resident aliens, 12 strangers, and 2 slaves at work; there are also 57 other names which are too indefinite to be put into any category.*

Here, then, we have a clear case of free men and slaves working together at the same trade. Moreover, neither class displaces the other. At the end of three generations the change appears (if we may generalize from these two chance descriptions) to be slightly in favour of the free labourer.*

On closer examination several other results emerge.

In the first place the slaves are working not only at the same trade but at identically the same tasks as the free labourers. In the case of the Erechtheum the piece of work paid for is the fluting of the columns. Each column is fluted by a little squad of from four to six workpeople directed by a foreman. All of them, including the foreman, are paid at the same rate. Slaves and free men seem indistinguishably mixed. In one case the foreman is

* Analysed by Francotte: *L'industrie dans la Grèce antique*, ii, 205, 207.

* Ciccotti, *Il tramonto della Schiavitù* (p. 118-9) gives reasons for the view that the tide of slave-labour tended slightly to recede after the middle of the 4th century, and he is borne out by Calderini (p. 32).

himself a slave; in another, a master who acts as foreman brings two slaves of his own and another hired from some one else for the occasion. The slaves of course do not receive the wage they earn. They pay it in to their masters, who give them back what they think fit.

In the second place, who are the strangers in the second set of inscriptions? They are not resident aliens, but contract labourers hired for the work in hand. This is a feature which is constantly recurring in our texts. Skilled, and even unskilled, workers have to be imported by communities in order to fill the gaps in their labour supply. So far from there being any chronic unemployment in the Greek City-States, the evidence seems to point to a chronic dearth of workers. For instance, Athens has to send masons and carpenters to Argos when the Argives wish to build long walls,¹ just as Hiram sent skilled labourers to Solomon; and in the inscriptions of Epidaurus we find a regular staff of recruiting agents whose function it is to collect and import the necessary labourers.²

One more point, before we attempt to draw any conclusions from these results. Assuming that the apprentice slave worked as well, or nearly as well, as the free labourer, was apprentice labour cheaper or more expensive than free labour? Here again inscriptions come to our aid. We have information from Eleusis as to the annual cost of keeping a working slave in the latter part of the 4th century. The bill works out approximately as follows³:

Food at 3 obols a day - - - -	180 drachmae
Clothing and incidental expenses - -	50 „
Interest on purchase money (at 12 per cent.)	40 „
	<hr/>
	270 drachmae

Now the daily wage of a free labourer at this period was a drachma and a half=540 drachmae a year.⁴ Even making allowance for holidays and reckoning in an additional sum for insurance, the discrepancy still remains very considerable. There can be no doubt that apprentice-labour was considerably more profitable to an employer than hired free labour.

Why then did apprentice-labour fail to displace free labour in

1. Thucydides, v. 82.

2. Details in Francotte, ii, 211.

3. Cf. Mauri, *I Cittadini lavoratori dell' Attica*, p. 85, Francotte, i. 329.

4. v. Jevons, Work and Wages in Athens, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xv (1895), pp. 239 ff.

industries where the two worked side by side? Why, in spite of the sentiment against slave-occupations, in spite of 4th century theories about the vulgarity of labour and the dignity of leisure, do we find less apprentices building in 329 than in 409.

To deal with this question satisfactorily would carry us very far afield. I can do no more than suggest two tentative explanations.

In the first place apprentice slavery is not a permanent status. At any given moment there is in the normal City-State, a class of apprentices; but it is a class which is constantly being emptied of its best workers. It is a Danaids' cask. No doubt the economist, with an eye only for normal conditions, must conceive of the cask as being continually replenished. But the historian must take account of the huge obstacles with which all Greek merchants, and especially those who deal in slaves, had to contend. The chances of warfare and raiding, the insecurity of the seas, the oscillations of prices, the difficulty of dealing with local markets in the absence of quick sources of information, the rapid changes in the political conditions of Greek cities and in the purchasing power of their inhabitants, the risk of dealing in so uncertain a commodity as human beings, many of whom, moreover, required a long period of training* before they could be satisfactorily disposed of, all these serve to explain why the tide of apprentice-labour never succeeded in sweeping over the whole field of City-State activity. Apprentice-labour in fact was always trying to oust free labour by its superior cheapness; but its best fighters always deserted just at the moment of victory, and it therefore never entirely succeeded, and, in the end, entirely succumbed, in what proved to be an unequal struggle. It is sometimes said that slavery destroyed City-State life. It would be truer to say that City-State life destroyed slavery.

Our second answer has already been suggested by what was said above about the dearth of labour in the Greek cities. If there was no chronic unemployment, and consequently no competition for employment, among free workers in the Greek city States, there was also no competition between free workers and apprentices or between the apprentices themselves. There were, as has been said, too few apprentices rather than too many. Apprentice slaves were in even greater demand than other workers, because their labour was cheaper; but they were even more difficult to procure, because they involved a capital outlay. The effect of their presence,

* For slave training-schools, see Hdt. 8, 105 : *Ar. Pol.* 1255, b. 25.

bargaining through their masters, upon wages, in a society where the remuneration of free workers was almost entirely fixed by custom, would be an interesting but intricate study. But here we can do no more than point out that the dearth of labour which their failure reveals applied to all forms of economic activity from the highest to the lowest.

Here then we are brought face to face with larger problems. The question of the introduction of slave-labour cannot be considered apart from the general policy, so unfamiliar in an age of trade-unionism but characteristic of the Greek City-State at a certain point in its development, of encouraging and, where possible, compelling the immigration of foreign craftsmen. We have not to think of apprentices as a peculiar class branded with the brand of Cain and reserved for certain special occupations, but as part of the huge army of intelligent workers, people's workers (*δημιουργοί*), as the Greeks often called them, who took their share in building up Greek civilization as we know it. Here, as elsewhere, the speculations of the aristocratic philosophers, living, as only a small fraction of Greeks could afford to live, on independent incomes, have led us astray. The great Greek writers, the writers who show us City-State civilization at its highest, from Homer to Thucydides, are safer guides. The Greeks made very little distinction between different branches of intelligent activity and craftsmanship—between theoretical and practical, intellectual and manual, skilled and unskilled, the rendering of services and the production of commodities—between architect and mason, doctor and herbalist, judge and juryman, engineer and navy, philosopher and elementary teacher. This, of course, is what is meant by saying that City-State life was democratic; but the economic applications of democracy are so unfamiliar to us that we miss their bearings, and are genuinely surprised when the inscriptions show us sculptors and schoolmasters paid at the same rate as day labourers.¹ Everyone who makes a living by his occupation and is not simply a brute or a chattel is a worker, from Arion with his dithyrambs and Thales who used his "philosophy" to carry an army over a difficult river and make a corner in olive-presses, down to the mixer in a doctor's dispensary or the assistant in a scent-shop on the Agora.²

1. Details in Francotte, i, 316—326, who summarizes the Erechtheum payments as follows: le salaire normal pour toutes les catégories d'ouvriers depuis l'architecte jusqu'au manoeuvre, pour les hommes libres comme pour les esclaves, est d'une drachme par jour.

2. See Hdt. i, 24, 75; Ar. Pol. 1259 a 6; Plato Laws, 720; Hypereides, 5.

One of the principal objects of a growing City-State community anxious to raise its standard of civilization was to attract as many as possible of these craftsmen as subjects within its walls. Just as Peter the Great, and a generation ago the Japanese, went westward to attract European teachers, and as the English in the Middle Ages welcomed Flemings and Lombards, so a prosperous Greek community opened its doors to resident aliens and apprentice slaves. We can trace the whole process in the history of Athens from the early attempts of Solon, through Pisistratus, with his court of foreign poets, soothsayers, and sculptors, through Cleisthenes who even introduced many "strangers and alien slaves" into his new tribes, down to Themistocles who gave "resident aliens and craftsmen" immunity from taxation, and Cimon who sent 20,000 slaves home after the battle of the Eurymedon, and Nicias who in the culminating moment of the Sicilian expedition addresses the aliens in his ranks as "the only free partakers with us in the Athenian Empire." As the old Oligarch puts it, with his usual bluntness, "the city wants aliens, because of the number of crafts and because of the fleet" (which withdraws a number of citizens, he explains, from active work); "that is why we give the aliens equal rights." And that, as he tells us a little earlier, is also why the slaves must be treated so gingerly and you are not allowed to knock them down when you feel inclined.¹

The desire to attract working immigrants is not uncommon among rising states; but in Greece it was carried far further than in the analogous cases which have been quoted. The expedient of introducing apprentice-slaves is almost peculiar to the Greeks and the Romans. No doubt one cause of this is to be found in the special relations existing between the Greeks and the barbarians who lived around them. But leaving these aside, let us close by inquiring to what special causes in the Greek City State itself this dearth of labour may have been due.

Three main reasons, I think, can be suggested. The first is the poverty of the City-State world. The Greeks created European civilization, with all the desires and refinements and luxuries with which it is bound up. When we look at the Parthenon and the theatre of Dionysus, or read the inventory of the Acropolis treasures, we are apt to forget the relative poverty of the society which created them and the heavy sacrifice which their creation entailed. Greek life is still so shrouded in romance that we are

1. The references are: Plut., Sol. 24; Ar. Pol. 1275, b. 36; Diod. xi, 43 and 62; Thuc. vii, 62, 3; [Xen], 'Aθ Πολ., ii, 10-12.

slow to detect the inconsistencies of our imagination. At one moment we marvel at the richness of its achievements; the next we smile contemptuously at its childish simplicity and deride its crude efforts at economic organization and ridiculous ignorance of mechanical processes. But, for good or for evil, "the Greeks ran their world by hand";* and consequently the natural resources which they tapped were ludicrously small. Even in Athens, the richest of all the City-States, with a large income from tribute, only 1,200 out of some 35,000 citizens could provide their own horses in war time. They were engaged then in an impossible task. They were attempting to meet the needs of a modern civilized community with the help of archaic or mediæval resources. Their economic organization was not equal to the strain which these new needs placed upon it. They had no efficient arrangements for the productive investment of capital: no system of public credit: no powerful government departments or groups of financiers and contractors for the execution of public or private works. They had not the wealth to pay for what they wanted; and they were too ignorant and too unsystematic to set about the task of creating it. Once this is realized a great deal of what is obscure in Greek history and Greek political and moral thought becomes clear. It explains the brutal materialism of Thucydides and the desperate asceticism of the moralists, Herodotus' touching interest in Croesus and Plato's dying invective against Atlantis. This is not the place to pursue this reflection further. But it will serve to explain the prevailing cult of aggression and its natural satisfaction in almost incessant warfare; and to throw light too on the question of imported craftsmen. For the material resources of civilization require capital and labour. If capital cannot be procured, or can only be procured with difficulty and injustice, there is all the more need to procure labour; and when, as in the case of slaves, the labour is also capital, and requires no money payment when procured, the pressure towards slave-dealing or slave raiding becomes irresistible. Hence all the Greek City-States, when they reached the point at which they became conscious of the material needs of civilization, were eager to hale in workers from outside.

There is a second reason connected with the conditions of ancient craftsmanship. Nowadays industry and industrial processes are cosmopolitan. Given sufficient capital to purchase the raw material and machinery, an industry can be set up anywhere.

* Wells, *A Modern Utopia*, p. 48.

Labour and capacity will flow to it. Its success or failure will depend on many varying considerations, but want of knowledge will seldom be one of them; for knowledge, even when protected by patents, is practically cosmopolitan, and like everything else, it can be bought. But the Greek world was a world of trade-secrets and patents; craftsmanship (whether in poetry or in medicine or in sculpture or in pottery) was handed down as a mystery from generation to generation and the skilled craftsman always bore with him something of the halo of the wizard. Homer and Asklepios, Daedalus and Hippocrates, Polygnotus and Euphronius each create a school and a tradition; and the tradition is jealously guarded till its guardians become almost a caste. "Glaucus of Chios," says Herodotus¹ in his naive way, "was the only man who found out how to weld iron." Clearly Glaucus kept the secret to himself.

This explains, of course, the peculiar character of Greek craft guilds, which were not trade-unions or employers' associations in our sense of the word, and indeed did not exist primarily, or rather ostensibly, for economic objects at all. They were religious and social. Ziebarth, who has made a careful study of the mass of the inscriptional evidence relating to them, from the philosophers' schools and associations of actors and musicians down to silversmiths, tanners, fishermen, laundry-men, and municipal slaves, has the hardihood to assert that any permanent association of a group of men merely for purpose of mutual profit was contrary to Greek religious instincts. "Religious interests were their only durable bond of union."² We have no right to contradict him. But a great deal depends upon the scope and meaning of "religious interests," as the story of the silversmiths at Ephesus reminds us.

The Greek world is therefore a world of local specialization,—not specialization in the modern sense of the sub-division of labour (of which there was very little) but specialization in the sense of inherited local craftsmanship and aptitudes. Localities became associated with certain familiar forms of production, and, in a society swayed by custom rather than by fashion, where the form of an amphora or a tripod remained unchanged for centuries, the tradition of local craftsmanship persisted with astonishing tenacity. Miss Ramsay showed not long ago how the peculiar patterns on

1. i. 25. For Aristotle on Patents see Pol. 1268 a 7, b 22.

2. Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, pp. 12, 13; for α κοινὸν τῶν τῆς πλάσσεως δούλων see p. 46.

the tombstones at Iconium in Asia Minor still survive on the embroideries made by the peasants there at the present day.¹

Now the object of every Greek city is to be self-sufficient, and one of the boasts of a wealthy and growing city is, as we know from the Funeral Speech, that it is self-sufficient in luxuries as well as in necessities and can provide everything that a civilized man needs for his comfort. No doubt in a sense, in the inverted and ingenious sense in which Thucydides is fond of using political catchwords, a maritime city with a large import-trade is self-sufficient in luxuries. But she will be more self-sufficient still, and certainly far securer, if she harbours the foreign craftsman within her own walls; and this is certainly what Athens tried her best to do.

In this way then, the local character of ancient craftsmanship drove states to the policy of promoting the immigration of labour. It will be seen that it mattered little whether the immigrants were free men or slaves, provided they worked willingly and brought their crafts with them.² But the historical evidence seems to show, as we should expect, that the immigration of free craftsmen tended to precede the immigration of slaves. For the wave of immigration began in most parts of Greece under the auspices of the tyrants; and the tyrants had political reasons for preaching the dignity of free labour and not too much leisure for politics.

This will serve to introduce our third and concluding point, which raises the disputed question of the attitude of the Greeks

1. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 289.

2. Details in Francotte i, 51. Compare Bérard, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*, i, 367ff, and the following extract from Hakluyt's *Voyages*, vol. v, p. 234 (Maclehose edition), under the heading *Remembrances for a Factor: what you shall do in Turkey, beside the business of your factorship*; dated 1582:—

1. Forasmuch as it is reported that the Woollen clothes dyed in Turkey be most excellently died, you shall send home into this realm certain Mowsters or pieces of Shew to be brought to the Dyers hall, there to be shewed, partly to remove out of their heads the great opinion they have conceived by their own cunning, and partly to move them for shame to endeavour to learn more knowledge to the honour of their country of England and to the universal benefit of the realm.

2. You shall devise to amend the dying of England by carrying hence an apt young man brought up in the Art, or by bringing one or another from thence of skill, or rather to devise to bring one for Silks and another for Wool and for Woollen cloth, and if you cannot work this by ordinary means, then to work it by some great base mean, or if your own credit be not sufficient by means of your small abode in those parts, to work it by the help of the French ambassador there resident, for which purpose you may insinuate yourself into his acquaintance, and otherwise to leave no mean unsought that tendeth to this end wherein you are to do as circumstances may permit.

towards manual labour and the dignity of leisure. There can be no doubt that City-State democracy necessitated an amount of free time and public spirit incompatible with the demands of modern industrial life. The modern man who is engaged in earning his livelihood puts his citizenship into odd half hours and is a wage earner or a family man for the rest of the day. Not so the Greek, or the Mediterranean man under any form of civilization. He is less of a family man, for he lives mainly out of doors and goes home only to sleep and perhaps to eat. And he is less of a worker, for he objects (and the climate sustains his objection) to any form of monotonous concentrated labour, particularly when it involves remaining indoors and in a constrained and awkward posture. This is what is meant by the Greek prejudice against "menial work." There is no more typical Greek than Xenophon, and this is how he puts this matter: "The so-called menial occupations are despised; and it is quite right that cities should rate them low. For they murder the bodies of those who work at them and spend their time on them, by compelling them to remain indoors and sedentary and sometimes even to spend all day by the fire."¹ And the testimony of Xenophon is borne out by the most probable derivation of the word *βαναυσία* which connects it with work done by the fire. Its meaning has been obscured by the philosophers, who took a current prejudice, widened its range and transformed its meaning, till almost every method of earning a livelihood from teaching philosophy downwards ceased to be respectable, and no forms of activity remained worthy of a civilized being beyond contemplation and politics and fighting.

We can see the effects of this Greek objection to monotonous indoor activity in almost every department of City-State life: in their philosophy, which dispensed with books and aired itself in the market-place but never succeeded in organizing knowledge or building up any great scientific tradition; in their astonishing success in building and sculpture and their failure to develop beyond the simplest mechanical inventions; above all in their desire to remain their own masters and their reluctance to surrender the right to spend their own time in their own way. The Greeks never took kindly to wage-earning: and a society like ours, where nearly every one is living under a contract, would be incomprehensible to their imaginations.²

1. *Oeconomicus*: iv, 2.

2. Compare Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 6 on Socrates' objection to people who taught for money; ἀνδραποδίστας εἶναι τῶν ἀτεκάλει διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον αὐτοῖς εἶναι διαλέγεσθαι παρ' ᾧ λαβόντων τὸν μίσθον.

Under these circumstances how did they get the material work of their civilization done? Much of it, as has been said, did *not* get done. Societies which dislike irksome work must be content to live in a slovenly manner. There are regions of Greek life into which it is wiser not to penetrate; but the curious reader cannot forget that what Dionysius of Halicarnassus (and other Greeks before him) thought the three things most worthy of admiration in Rome were the water supply, the street paving, and the sewers.¹ There were no wells in the Piraeus before the great plague; and even Pericles, who foresaw everything, is admitted by Thucydides to have overlooked the necessities of public health.²

But if the work was to be done, it could be done in two ways. There was the method of the 'call to work' and the method of imported labour. When the work was urgent the whole population could be called out, like an English village during the hay-making, to help in getting it done. That is how the walls of Athens were built in 478 and the walls of Argos in 417,³ women, children and slaves helping in the work. A better instance still is given us in Herodotus.⁴ The whole population of Onidus turns out to wall off the Isthmus which separated the town from the mainland. "And as they worked in a great body the workers appeared to them to be subject to unreasonable and possibly heaven-sent injuries in every part of their body and particularly in their eyes, owing to the splitting of the stone. So they sent messages to Delphi and asked what was hindering them. And the Pythia (so at least the Cnicians say), replied to them in iambics as follows: 'Do not fortify your isthmus, nor go on digging. For Zeus would have made it an island had he wished it.' " So the Cnicians ceased building and surrendered to the Persians without a struggle. This story illustrates better than any accumulation of further evidence why the Greeks desired outsiders, if possible, to help them to perform some of the more unpleasant forms of labour. It explains why a Greek would rather starve than work in a mine, and why there are thus certain forms of employment which were monopolized or almost monopolized, by slaves, freedmen, and metics. In a broad sense it is true to say that citizenship and

1. iii. 67 quoted in Pöhlmann, *Die Ubevölkerung der antiken Grosstädte*, p. 121. Compare Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, vol. ii, No. 500.

2. Thucydides, ii, 48, 2; 64, 1.

3. Thucydides, i, 90, 3, v. 82, 6.

4. Herodotus, i, 174.

wage-earning were incompatible, and that apprentices, freedmen, and metics were the wage-earners of the City-State world. For it must be remembered that all these three classes were normally debarred from owning land and were therefore deliberately shut out from what was the main employment and industry of the City-State world.

We have thus come, by a long and circuitous road, within view of the answer to the question from which we started. Greek society was not a slave-society; but it contained a sediment of slaves to perform its most degrading tasks, while the main body of its so-called slaves consisted of apprentices haled in from outside to assist, together and almost on equal terms with their masters, in creating the material basis of a civilization in which they were hereafter to share.

A. E. ZIMMERN.

DISCUSSIONS.

THE MORAL EDUCATION CONGRESS.

By THE HEADMASTER OF ETON COLLEGE.

Mr. GUSTAV SPILLER, in giving his views on the Congress held last autumn, draws a distinction between national and church systems of ethics which I submit is non-existent, at least in the way he has described it. His words are: "The school is thus ruled by two systems of ethics, the one supplied by the nation and the other by the churches. This state of things cannot continue much longer." Why not? Because "current theological ethics" are "strongly personal and otherworldly in tendency" and must give way to ethics with "a social and international background," and Mr. Spiller draws an interesting picture of the difference between these international ethics and those which held the field when our fore-fathers lived mainly in villages.

Now it may be conceded that modern civilization has introduced a vastly more complicated system of duties and claims than was in existence, say, previously to 1860. But life was certainly more complicated in 1860 than in 1760, and probably the claims on men's conduct were very different in 1760 from what they were in 500 or 1000 A.D. The question therefore arises, Why are Christian or theological or church ethics which apparently sufficed down to about 1809 (see p. 73) to be pronounced outworn now? And does Mr. Spiller mean that they sufficed for nations in such different stages of growth as France and Prussia in 1600 and yet have become effete for both countries and all other Christian countries during the last 100 years? If a certain ethical teaching proved fairly adequate during such immense transformations of national life it seems strange that on a sudden it should be very definitely and emphatically pronounced to be useless. There would seem to be a peculiar power in "Christian ethics" of adaptation to very various stages of civilization. Why has it failed now and not long before?

But this question is superficial. I wish to traverse Mr. Spiller's assumption that "theological ethics" and "international or national ethics" are two different systems. The idea that they are rests on the prevalent view that Christ taught a system of ethics which the "churches" have received and handed on. But any careful examination of the moral teaching in the Gospels will confirm a very different view. It will show that what Christ did was to implant a motive and declare a power in man, both depending on his relation to God. The teaching necessary to explain that relation was illustrated by many references to moral duties and customs, but not with the object of revealing new duties or of outlining in any sense a system of ethics.

It is, moreover, impossible to make anything of Mr. Spiller's

use of the adjective "otherworldly" as applied to "theological ethics." In so far as the church has been true to teaching Christianity she has taught that man's relation to God now, while he is living on earth, is such as to fill him with an endless hope, not only for a life after death, but for his present life. And it is a commonplace among New Testament students that Christ paid little attention to the future or the past but concentrated it on the present. That the Church has at times taught disproportionately about rewards and punishments beyond the grave I am not concerned to deny. But never has that criticism been less applicable than it is now to the Anglican Church or to the Nonconformist bodies.

Mr. Spiller appears to mean that "Christian ethics" told man what to do in simple relations of life, but left him unguided when the electric telegraph and other inventions made life complex.

to any form of monotonous concentrated labour, particularly when it involves remaining indoors and in a constrained and awkward posture. This is what is meant by the Greek prejudice against "menial work." There is no more typical Greek than Xenophon, and this is how he puts this matter: "The so-called menial occupations are despised; and it is quite right that cities should rate them low. For they murder the bodies of those who work at them and spend their time on them, by compelling them to remain indoors and sedentary and sometimes even to spend all day by the fire."¹ And the testimony of Xenophon is borne out by the most probable derivation of the word *βαρβαρία* which connects it with work done by the fire. Its meaning has been obscured by the philosophers, who took a current prejudice, widened its range and transformed its meaning, till almost every method of earning a livelihood from teaching philosophy downwards ceased to be respectable, and no forms of activity remained worthy of a civilized being beyond contemplation and politics and fighting.

We can see the effects of this Greek objection to monotonous indoor activity in almost every department of City-State life: in their philosophy, which dispensed with books and aired itself in the market-place but never succeeded in organizing knowledge or building up any great scientific tradition; in their astonishing success in building and sculpture and their failure to develop beyond the simplest mechanical inventions; above all in their desire to remain their own masters and their reluctance to surrender the right to spend their own time in their own way. The Greeks never took kindly to wage-earning: and a society like ours, where nearly every one is living under a contract, would be incomprehensible to their imaginations.²

1. *Oeconomicus*: iv, 2.

2. Compare Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 6 on Socrates' objection to people who taught for money; ἀνδραποδίστας εἰναι ἀπεκάλει διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον αὐτοῖς εἶναι διαλέγεσθαι παρ' ὧν λάβουεν τὸν μίσθον.

geously meet and discuss intricate problems of civilization because each party consists of a group of learners who have the same end in view, the lifting the lives of their fellow men. And so far from "Christian ethics" being outworn, it would be easy to show that *on the whole* the moral stimulus to efforts in social reform of all kinds is vigorous where Christianity is vigorous and languid where Christianity flags.

It may be worth remarking that there is one definite precept of conduct to which Christians are committed, that is monogamy. It is conceivable that the opinions of certain so-called "Free-Love" sects may gain ground. I doubt it; but, if they should, there will then be a conflict between Church ethics and others. And if congresses are held to secure the incorporation of the advanced views into young minds, I should prophesy some rather baffling developments in the moral education of the future. But this

to have overlooked the necessities of public health.¹

But if the work was to be done, it could be done in two ways. There was the method of the 'call to work' and the method of imported labour. When the work was urgent the whole population could be called out, like an English village during the hay-making, to help in getting it done. That is how the walls of Athens were built in 478 and the walls of Argos in 417,² women, children and slaves helping in the work. A better instance still is given us in Herodotus.⁴ The whole population of Onidus turns out to wall off the Isthmus which separated the town from the mainland. "And as they worked in a great body the workers appeared to them to be subject to unreasonable and possibly heaven-sent injuries in every part of their body and particularly in their eyes, owing to the splitting of the stone. So they sent messages to Delphi and asked what was hindering them. And the Pythia (so at least the Cnicians say), replied to them in iambics as follows: 'Do not fortify your isthmus, nor go on digging. For Zeus would have made it an island had he wished it.' " So the Cnicians ceased building and surrendered to the Persians without a struggle. This story illustrates better than any accumulation of further evidence why the Greeks desired outsiders, if possible, to help them to perform some of the more unpleasant forms of labour. It explains why a Greek would rather starve than work in a mine, and why there are thus certain forms of employment which were monopolized or almost monopolized, by slaves, freedmen, and metics. In a broad sense it is true to say that citizenship and

1. iii. 67 quoted in Pöhlmann, *Die Übervölkerung der antiken Grosstädte*, p. 121. Compare Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, vol. ii, No. 500.

2. Thucydides, ii, 48, 2; 64, 1.

3. Thucydides, i, 90, 3, v. 82, 6.

4. Herodotus, i, 174.

wage-earning were incompatible, and that apprentices, freedmen, and metics were the wage-earners of the City-State world. For it must be remembered that all these three classes were normally debarred from owning land and were therefore deliberately shut out from what was the main employment and industry of the City-State world.

We have thus come, by a long and circuitous road, within view of the answer to the question from which we started. Greek society was not a slave-society; but it contained a sediment of slaves to perform its most degrading tasks, while the main body of its so-called slaves consisted of apprentices haled in from outside to assist, together and almost on equal terms with their masters, in creating the material basis of a civilization in which they were hereafter to share.

A. E. ZIMMERN.

DISCUSSIONS.

THE MORAL EDUCATION CONGRESS.

By THE HEADMASTER OF ETON COLLEGE.

Mr. GUSTAV SPILLER, in giving his views on the Congress held last autumn, draws a distinction between national and church systems of ethics which I submit is non-existent, at least in the way he has described it. His words are: "The school is thus ruled by two systems of ethics, the one supplied by the nation and the other by the churches. This state of things cannot continue much longer." Why not? Because "current theological ethics" are "strongly personal and otherworldly in tendency" and must give way to ethics with "a social and international background," and Mr. Spiller draws an interesting picture of the difference between these international ethics and those which held the field when our fore-fathers lived mainly in villages.

Now it may be conceded that modern civilization has introduced a vastly more complicated system of duties and claims than was in existence, say, previously to 1860. But life was certainly more complicated in 1860 than in 1760, and probably the claims on men's conduct were very different in 1760 from what they were in 500 or 1000 A.D. The question therefore arises, Why are Christian or theological or church ethics which apparently sufficed down to about 1809 (see p. 73) to be pronounced outworn now? And does Mr. Spiller mean that they sufficed for nations in such different stages of growth as France and Prussia in 1600 and yet have become effete for both countries and all other Christian countries during the last 100 years? If a certain ethical teaching proved fairly adequate during such immense transformations of national life it seems strange that on a sudden it should be very definitely and emphatically pronounced to be useless. There would seem to be a peculiar power in "Christian ethics" of adaptation to very various stages of civilization. Why has it failed now and not long before?

But this question is superficial. I wish to traverse Mr. Spiller's assumption that "theological ethics" and "international or national ethics" are two different systems. The idea that they are rests on the prevalent view that Christ taught a system of ethics which the "churches" have received and handed on. But any careful examination of the moral teaching in the Gospels will confirm a very different view. It will show that what Christ did was to implant a motive and declare a power in man, both depending on his relation to God. The teaching necessary to explain that relation was illustrated by many references to moral duties and customs, but not with the object of revealing new duties or of outlining in any sense a system of ethics.

It is, moreover, impossible to make anything of Mr. Spiller's

use of the adjective "otherworldly" as applied to "theological ethics." In so far as the church has been true to teaching Christianity she has taught that man's relation to God now, while he is living on earth, is such as to fill him with an endless hope, not only for a life after death, but for his present life. And it is a commonplace among New Testament students that Christ paid little attention to the future or the past but concentrated it on the present. That the Church has at times taught disproportionately about rewards and punishments beyond the grave I am not concerned to deny. But never has that criticism been less applicable than it is now to the Anglican Church or to the Nonconformist bodies.

Mr. Spiller appears to mean that "Christian ethics" told man what to do in simple relations of life, but left him unguided when the electric telegraph and other inventions made life complex. But Christian ethics are ordinary ethics based on the motive of serving a personal God and transfused with hope. That is to say, the Church has to learn what ought to be done in industrial troubles by examining the conditions of each problem, exactly as governments have to do. The difference is that till there was a church no government thought it worth while to examine any such problem because the "theological" notion was absent.

These considerations throw some light on the moral education question. What I hold to be the normal training of a human being is first the implanting of the religious idea through the natural love of parents: then the developing of that idea by means of moral struggle, conquering inclinations and so forth: the painfulness of the process being borne for the sake of the parental and religious idea in the background. As years go on moral effort takes more and more the form of working for others, and duty becomes more complex, more difficult to practice without disastrous blunders.

Now I am disposed to join issue with our ethical friends if their programme is to teach morals without a background, not because I want religious controversy, but because I cannot believe the thing can be done. Everyone would be captivated by the simplicity of the project, and the freedom from trouble for the government that would some day draw up a bill; but there is one thing worse than strife, and that is after abandoning religion to make a mess of morals. And if it be said that religious teachers fail in their own programme I would admit that some do, even though men have practised it for 1800 years; but is it not a little sanguine to expect teachers to succeed in a totally different programme in which they have had no practice at all?

Still, moral instruction is needed; I mean as a thing not definitely bound up with religion. Certain subjects, such as card-playing, chastity, schoolboy honour, patriotism, require teaching which may be very useful though simply moral. On such subjects teachers of even young boys may well confer together as to their methods.

May I demur to the expression "theological ethics?" The adjective means that which is concerned with reasoning about God, and it is hard to see how it can apply to any ethics.

I hold, therefore, that churchmen and secularists may advanta-

geously meet and discuss intricate problems of civilization because each party consists of a group of learners who have the same end in view, the lifting the lives of their fellow men. And so far from "Christian ethics" being outworn, it would be easy to show that *on the whole* the moral stimulus to efforts in social reform of all kinds is vigorous where Christianity is vigorous and languid where Christianity flags.

It may be worth remarking that there is one definite precept of conduct to which Christians are committed, that is monogamy. It is conceivable that the opinions of certain so-called "Free-Love" sects may gain ground. I doubt it; but, if they should, there will then be a conflict between Church ethics and others. And if congresses are held to secure the incorporation of the advanced views into young minds, I should prophecy some rather baffling developments in the moral education of the future. But this subject is quite apart from Mr. Spiller's paper.

E. LYTTELTON.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF POSITIVISM.¹

THE recent publication of two important volumes may be taken to mark the end of the first phase of English Positivism. Of the four notable English thinkers who, for the last fifty years, have chiefly represented in the public eye the religious movement inaugurated by Auguste Comte, two have passed away, and the others have practically retired from active life. While they have handed on the torch to a new generation of apostles, there cannot but be some break in the tradition, and this crisis affords a fitting opportunity of summing up the results of the propaganda, and of forecasting its future. The justice of the claim that the leaders of the Positivist body have sought influence rather than discipleship must be admitted, and there can be little doubt that in this their efforts have been eminently successful. It is not of course wholly due to them that in this country at least, in spite of certain reactionary forces, the trend of opinion and social practice has brought us far on the journey away from theological prepossessions towards a scientific philosophy and the virtual adoption of a humanistic ideal; the spirit of the time has on the whole been in their favour. But the appearance of these volumes is a reminder of how much contemporary thought and feeling owe to the fearless stand made by this devoted group of men.

The method chosen by Mr. Frederic Harrison of illustrating one aspect or another of the faith with which his name is so largely identified by the reissue in book form of selected examples of his articles and addresses is not without its disadvantages; it is apt to lead to repetitions and inconsistencies of statement, such as may be found in "The Philosophy of Common Sense," in which the philosophic basis of Positivism is chiefly expounded and

1. "The Philosophy of Common Sense." By Frederic Harrison. London: Macmillan & Co., 1907.

"Essays and Addresses." By the late John Henry Bridges, M.B., F.R.C.P., with an Introduction by Frederic Harrison. London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1907.

defended. But, nevertheless, it forms a very effective means of serving his purpose. Though the autobiographical interest is not so strong in this as in the preceding volume of the series, "The Creed of a Layman," it is by no means wanting, and if it cannot be said that much development of doctrine is shown between the earlier and the later expressions to justify a chronological arrangement, there is, in the controversial articles at least, a verve and piquancy that would have been lost if they had not been presented in their original form, as called forth by definite occasions. It is difficult to say whether Mr. Harrison achieves greater success in exposition or in argument. Though the volume is chiefly devoted to purely intellectual considerations, there have naturally been many opportunities of producing emotional impressions, and of these no fuller advantage could well have been taken. But if the author is a master of eloquent persuasiveness, he is no less in his element when dealing hard blows at his antagonists. Whether he is attacking the obscurantism and insincerity of current professions of supernatural belief, or the unreality of the pseudo-theism of Herbert Spencer, whether materialism or mysticism or indifferentism be his mark, he shows himself at once a subtle, a courteous and an ingenuous dialectician. There is hardly a page that is not informed with keen insight and enlightened judgment, finding expression in brilliant and trenchant phrase.

The volume of "Essays and Addresses" by Dr. J. H. Bridges, whose life-long labours for the cause of Positivism are now ended, is to some extent similar in scope, but there is little of the controversial element in it. The first part of the book serves for a direct presentment of the author's faith, and follows constructive lines. Not only is the treatment expository, but the tone is almost devotional, and it would not be easy to imagine a more convincing recommendation of the doctrines and polity to the furtherance of which his life was devoted. The second part contains a selection of the most striking of Dr. Bridges' historical appreciations of men whose work is of special significance from the point of view of the Positivist synthesis. These studies are remarkable as affording evidence alike of the wide range of the author's sympathy and intellectual outlook, of his masterly grasp of the principles he enforces, and of his interpretative insight.

If, in a superficial sense, Positivism has failed to establish its ascendancy, it is because it has succeeded so well in influencing the determining currents of opinion and action that it has helped to bring about its own apotheosis as a distinctive faith. Many of those who value most highly the work of Comte and his followers would acquiesce in this absorption of the characteristic features of Positivism in the main stream of belief and conduct, holding that the militant attitude of a separatist organisation has reached the term of its usefulness. They might urge, at least, that the time has come to revise the formularies of the creed, so as to make sure that no stumbling block remains in the way of a wider and readier acceptance of its essential elements.

The volumes under review afford material for such a criticism. The doctrines to which the writers adhere are placed in such a variety of lights, are presented with such a wealth of comment and illustration, that it is almost enough to compare one statement with

another to discover what is of permanent and unassailable cogency, and what is merely adventitious. Much of the opposition with which the Religion of Humanity has met has been natural and unavoidable, but to some extent it has suffered in the house of its friends. In spite of its openness to development it has not escaped the fate of every religion in becoming stereotyped. Its framework, elastic though it is, has hindered its growth, and has perhaps sheltered it unduly from the healthy stimulus of outside influences. If the free play of sympathetic criticism should reveal the fact that certain positions and certain forms of expression to which prominence has been given, and which have proved a rock of offence to many, are not only unnecessary but are inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the system as these may be judged from the vantage-ground of the present, and if it should appear that the elimination or modification of such forms tends to widen the borders of the faith till they are lost in a still more comprehensive synthesis, would not this be the greatest triumph that Positivism could achieve?

The process of rehabilitation may not be accomplished by any individual critic; perhaps even a generation of criticism will be no more than adequate for the task. But, as has been said, the leading apologists for the doctrines of the Positivist faith, as these have hitherto been understood, have themselves taken the initiative, consciously or unconsciously; it is enough to hold them to their own ideals. It may be anticipated that if the leading positions were strengthened where they admit of it, this would make at once for a greater simplicity on the theoretic side and for a wider practical appeal. An illustration will make this clear. A great difficulty has been felt in regard to the sense in which Humanity is proposed as an object of worship. The matter has been dealt with by the Positivist leaders again and again, but their explanations are neither consistent nor convincing. In an interesting passage written in 1884, Mr. Harrison expresses his willingness to give up the use of the words "humanity," "worship," and "religion," but it would appear that no one held him to his offer. In another paragraph (p. 294) he writes "no Positivist ever did ask anybody to *adore* anything or anybody," but in speaking elsewhere (p. 82) of the essential meaning of religion he refers to "some great Principle in which we believe, which we love and adore." If in one aspect all this is only a question of phraseology, which does not affect fundamentals, there are yet strong reasons why it should be fully discussed, so that a practice may be established which would obviate all unnecessary prejudices. It may be suggested that Comte and his followers, in their anxiety to preserve the emotional element that is so marked a feature of anthropomorphic religions, have sought their end too directly; it would have been a safer procedure to strengthen to the utmost the guidance of individual and social conduct by building up a sound philosophy, and let the feelings that are in harmony with such a doctrine and practice find a natural expression for themselves. It is very doubtful whether anything has been gained, and it is certain that much has been lost, by the attempt to attach a scientific value to metaphorical terms, as "love," "adoration," "gratitude," "worship," undoubtedly are when they are used in any relation

but that between two conscious personalities. Some of the reasoning by which this practice is defended seems rather sophistical. Love of one's family stands for an individual feeling towards each member of it, but when the word is used in regard to so large a unit as country or race it is only a figure of speech, which does not admit of scientific precision without careful analysis, and is therefore unsuitable and misleading in a formal expression of belief. Mr. Harrison professes (p. 397) that nothing will induce him "to address Humanity as a conscious being, or in any way whatever to treat it as a Person;" but he goes on to justify the use of the word "gratitude" in regard to it, on the ground that if he can feel grateful to his parents even after they are dead, he must equally be able to feel grateful towards his school, his country, or his race. There is no true analogy here. We can have the feeling of gratitude towards those who are dead only by imagining them for the moment as conscious persons, but this is admittedly impossible in regard to collective units, especially where an abstraction has to be made "of such lives and only of those parts of each man's life, which are impersonal, which are social, which have converged to the common good" (Dr. Bridges, p. 88). The objection is even greater to the use of the word "prayer." "To pray," writes Dr. Bridges (p. 7), "is to form the ideal of our life by entering into communion with the Highest." This is surely a gross misuse of words. "Communion" *must* mean a reciprocal act. That there is a high value in reflecting on what we owe to the achievements of humanity in the past is undoubted, but the use of anthropomorphic conceptions in connection with such reflections must in the end be a hindrance rather than a help to their efficacy. If the essential truths which it has been the noble mission of Positivism to proclaim and uphold are to be recognised as the basis of the religion of the future, they must be freed from misleading associations and untenable pretensions. There is no need to make any less of the illuminating conception of humanity as the chief source of good and the object of all service, but there must be no constraint on the feelings which would naturally attach themselves either to the conception or to the scheme of conduct it prescribes. It may be that awe, reverence, and submissiveness will not be characteristic emotions of the religion of the future.

It would almost seem that the unnatural exaltation of humanity has had a cramping effect on the development of the Positive philosophy. In their zeal for the assertion of "the subjective synthesis" the leaders of the movement have at times shown an obscurantist attitude towards objective generalisations that is foreign to the teaching of Comte. This is apparent in their treatment both of those who, instead of regarding all metaphysical questions with agnostic aloofness, have tried by psychological analysis to apply scientific methods to their solution, and of those who have sought a unifying principle in nature outside of specifically human relations. It is surprising to find Mr. Harrison, who in an article written more than thirty years ago refers with just appreciation (p. 113) to "the great value of the process Mr. Lewes has employed in separating the intelligible from the unintelligible part of the metaphysical problem," and his "inestimable service" in "forcing the unscientific aspects of these questions into the

most exact and limited ground"—it is surprising to find him adding in a postscript of recent date, "His [Lewes'] attempt to revive Metaphysics under a scientific aspect has deservedly failed." The luminous suggestions of Lewes for the interpretation of metaphysical categories in terms of scientific law show more of the spirit of Positivism than the assertion that the so-called ultimate problems,—the existence of the Absolute, freewill, the origin of evil, etc.,—are insoluble,—an assertion which assumes gratuitously that the conceptions which have given birth to such discussions are incapable of scientific analysis and explanation. No more satisfactory is the attitude of the Positivist leaders towards the doctrine of Evolution. Mr. Harrison, it is true, formally admits his acceptance of the principle, saying (p. 279) that no one "can hold on to the doctrine of Evolution as the key to the changes not only of Nature, but of Man, more stoutly than does the Positivist," but he loses no opportunity of tilting against what he calls the philosophy or religion of Evolution, as he conceives it to be represented by Mr. Herbert Spencer. Now no one has ever regarded the doctrine of Evolution as either a philosophy or a religion in this absolute sense,—certainly not Mr. Spencer, who has considered his exposition of evolution, as a principle of scientific explanation in the sphere of the knowable, so insufficient as a final summing-up that he has tried to elaborate a philosophy, if not a pseudo-religion, out of his conceptions of the Unknowable. It is possible to sympathise fully with Mr. Harrison in his scorn for the futile metaphysics on which this ill-advised attempt is based, while maintaining that the fabric of constructive science raised on the unifying principle of evolution, with which the so-called philosophy of the Unknowable has really nothing to do, is a most valuable contribution to the sum of our positive knowledge.

JAMES OLIPHANT.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Sociological Society was held at 24, Buckingham Street, W.C., on January 18th, 1909, Mr. S. H. Swinny, chairman of the Council, presiding. On the motion of Sir Edward Brabrook, seconded by Professor Geddes, Mr. Frederic Harrison was unanimously elected President of the Society for the ensuing year. Mr. S. H. Swinny was unanimously re-elected to the chairmanship of the Council, on the motion of Sir Lewis Tupper, seconded by Lieutenant-Colonel Ernest Roberts, I.M.S. On the motion of the chairman, who spoke of their great services to the Society, Mr. J. Martin White was unanimously re-elected honorary treasurer and Mr. V. V. Branford honorary secretary. The following members were elected to the Council :

Mr. W. H. Beveridge
 Sir John A. Cockburn
 Miss Findlay
 Dr. A. C. Haddon
 Professor Hobhouse
 Professor C. S. Loch
 Mr. George Montagu
 Mr. H. O. Newland
 Dr. C. W. Saleeby
 Dr. J. W. Slaughter
 Mr. G. A. Touche
 Professor E. J. Urwick

Rev. A. Caldecott, D.D.,
 Miss C. E. Collet
 Professor Geddes
 Mr. P. J. Hartog
 Mr. J. A. Hobson
 Mr. David Mair
 Dr. F. W. Mott
 Mr. J. Oliphant
 Mr. Alex. Shand
 Mr. R. H. Tawney
 Sir C. Lewis Tupper
 Professor Westermarck

After the accounts and balance sheet had been presented by the honorary treasurer and unanimously adopted, the chairman called the attention of the meeting to the fact that the deficit had been reduced by more than half (over £100), so that the promise given at the previous annual meeting that the re-arrangement in regard to the accounts of the *Sociological Review* would be advantageous had been fulfilled. It was announced from the chair that notice had been given to quit the present rooms in Buckingham Street at Midsummer, 1909, and further that a very large number of applications had been received in response to the advertisement for a secretary and were being considered by the Council. Referring to the resignation of the secretary, the chairman expressed the regret of the Society at losing the services of Dr. J. W. Slaughter. His resignation had been rendered necessary by the increasing calls upon him as a lecturer, but he was glad that Dr. Slaughter would be able to continue his assistance to the Society as a member of the Council.

The formal business being finished, Sir Edward Brabrook, C.B., read his presidential address, as follows :—

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS, 1909.

By SIR EDWARD BRABROOK, C.B.

1. *Preliminary Observations.* The first thing I have to do upon rising from this Chair is to thank you for the great and unmerited honour you conferred upon me last year by electing me President of the Sociological Society. I do not know whether to feel more pride at your having selected me from the distinguished ranks of your Council for that honour, or more humiliation at the thought of the paramount claims that most of them possess for it by their writings and their labours in the interest of Sociology. At any rate, being here by your kindness, it becomes a pleasure as well as a duty for me to follow the excellent custom introduced by your first President, Mr. Bryce, and continued by Lord Avebury, of addressing a few words to you on the occasion of the Annual Meeting of the Society. Such an address necessarily has a twofold relation—it harks back to the events of the past, and it looks forward to what is to be done in the next and future years.

2. *Obituary.* The hand of death has as yet fallen but lightly upon us as regards our numbers. Among your Council I recollect the name of only one member as having been lost to us—the gentle and good Dr. J. H. Bridges, who attended our Council meetings up to the close of his life, and displayed the great interest he felt in the welfare of our society. To the Positivist community his loss is one that must be long remembered, and not easily supplied.

3. *Sociological Papers.* Our proceedings have resulted in the production of three volumes of sociological papers, and of the first volume of our quarterly *Sociological Review*. The three pioneer volumes have laid a solid foundation for our work. In the first, published in 1904, was contained Mr. Bryce's introductory address, which he followed up by an anniversary address at our first annual meeting on March 22nd, 1905. The three volumes extend over a wide range of subjects, and have been criticised as being miscellaneous. If they had not been open to that criticism, they would hardly have been so useful and inspiring, so comprehensive and complete, as in my humble opinion they really are.

I do not propose to weary you by an enumeration of the papers contained in those three volumes, but I wish in a few words to establish the position that together they constitute an adequate foundation for the superstructure we are building upon them, the outward presentation of which to the public is embodied in our *Sociological Review*. In the first volume Mr. Branford, who has been from the beginning our devoted and able honorary secretary, as he is in fact the founder of the society, traced the origin and use of the word sociology, and Professor Durkheim broadly defined the twofold method by which the study is to be pursued; in the second volume our lamented colleague Dr. Bridges stated its relation to the philosophy of history, and Professor Höfding its relation to ethics; while the third volume fitly closes with the paradox of Mr. H. G. Wells, that sociology is not a science at all,

but only so called. While in this manner broad principles were asserted, definite problems were not neglected. In the first volume, Dr. Westermarck's historical inquiry into the position of woman in early civilisation, and Dr. Mann's economic research into the life of an agricultural village; in the second volume Professor Sadler's paper on education; and in the third volume Mr. Beveridge's practical paper on the unemployed, and M. de Wesselitzky's informing essay on the Russian revolution, are instances in point. Further and beyond all this, throughout the three volumes there has run the discussion of two branches of applied sociology in which already marked progress is evident: eugenics, which is associated with the initiative of my honoured friend Mr. Francis Galton; and civics, which that strenuous worker Professor Geddes may claim to have made his own. It is a valuable feature of the three volumes that upon every subject not only have the *viva voce* discussions that actually took place at the reading of the papers been reported, but the criticisms and opinions of many authorities, both at home and abroad, who were unable to be present are furnished; so that the reader has before him all that there is to be said on both sides of every question, as well as in some cases the judicial summing up of the chairman. By mentioning the names of a few of the authors as typical representatives of our work, I mean no disparagement to the learned authors whose names I have omitted to mention.

4. *Sociological Review*.

The *Sociological Review* has made a n excellent start, under the able editorship of Professor Hobhouse. An adequate guarantee fund has been subscribed to ensure its production for three years, and by that time it will no doubt have established itself in a secure position. It not only comprises a record of the papers read before the society, but affords an opportunity for disquisitions upon sociological problems and an arena for discussions of current questions; and it contains as well reviews of new books and information of various kinds interesting to the members of this society and to its other readers. It may be expected to be circulated among many more persons than those who have been reached by the volumes of sociological essays. Many societies similar to our own find in a quarterly review the best means of advancing the interests of the sciences they are established to promote, and the publication of the *Sociological Review* may be looked upon as a distinct step in the progress of the Sociological Society. In his preliminary editorial remarks, Professor Hobhouse said, "We shall welcome contributions alike from the philosopher and the specialist, from the comparative sciences which search the whole human record for their data, and from the detailed study of contemporary tendencies. We hope to show that in the study of social evolution the organisation of a mediæval city or the genesis of an oriental religion has its place alongside of the analysis of contemporary institutions. We hope to show at the same time that the problems of the day are just as much objects of science as any period of past history or any phase of primitive life." That programme has been fully carried out in the volume that is before you.

5. *Classification of Members.* I now revert to Mr. Bryce's instructive address of March, 1905. He discriminated our members into three classes. The first, those who devote themselves specially and scientifically to the business of research in all those lines of inquiry which concern man as a social being. These he estimated as being a minority, but regarded them as those upon whom the bulk of the work would fall. The second, the amateurs, interested in the subject and desirous to have the broad results of inquiry, or of research into some subject of social interest, put before them in untechnical language in a popular way. These should be as numerous as possible, as they add to our material strength and contribute to the diffusion of knowledge on sociological subjects. The third, the practical men, who desire to ascertain the grounds and methods upon which they can most effectually benefit their fellow men, whether in the capacity of legislators or philanthropic workers. These were in his opinion a class for whom the scientific element in the society would do well to make provision. In his own parliamentary and official experience, he had learned that exact and thorough scientific knowledge can alone solve the social problems with which this country has to deal. The statute book furnishes strong evidence of the mischief arising from neglect of this warning.

6. *Meetings.* In the meetings of the society during the past year addresses have been delivered which cover a wide field of speculation and of practical utility. In theoretical sociology, we had Sir C. Lewis Tupper's paper on sociology and comparative politics, in which he suggested as a definition that "sociology is the scientific study of the origin, development, structure, functions, and decay of the ideas and institutions of mankind in successive stages of society," but guarded against the supposition that all stages were alike taken in regular succession by every society in the past; Mr. Gibbon's lecture on the past and future developments of human societies; Mr. Urwick's on sociology in relation to social progress, and Mr. Hobson's on the psychology of socialism. In method, we have had Professor Toennies' address on statistical enquiry. In the historical branch of our study, we have the paper in which Principal Jevons discussed the vexed question of the relations between magic and science and between magic and religion, and suggested the bases upon which an agreement as to those relations might be arrived at among students; Mr. Zimmermann's inquiry whether Greek civilisation was based upon slave labour, and Professor Graham Brooks' informing paper upon recent phases of race contact in the United States. The more practical side, as bearing upon current questions of great importance, has been illustrated by two papers relating to India: one on the aspects of the social movement there, by Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe, and the other on the social economy of India, by Colonel Roberts; as well as papers by Dr. Robert Hutchison on infant mortality, by Dr. Albert Wilson on the psychology of crime, and by Professor Geddes on town planning and city design in sociology and in citizenship.

7. *Work of Professor Geddes.* I cannot mention the name of Professor Geddes in this connection without referring to the grati-

tude we owe to him for the organisation of the Cities Committee; for his labours towards securing a representation of civic progress and civic enterprise at the Franco-British Exhibition; and for the effort he is making to preserve in Chelsea the last of London's great mediæval halls, in connection with his scheme of a university hostel or collegiate hall there.

8. *Finance.* In attempting to deal adequately with a subject or group of subjects that branches out in so many different directions and requires so much detailed investigation, it is not surprising that we should find ourselves at a disadvantage for the want of means. The smallness of our subscription list forbids us to launch out in many directions in which co-operative research might have been organised; and indeed we owe to the munificence of our excellent treasurer, Mr. Martin White, the possibility of our continued existence. I am glad to observe from the printed statement of accounts that there has been during the past year an improvement in the finances of the society. Taking all the circumstances into account, I think that the output of work of the society reflects credit on its officers and council under their chairman, Mr. Swinny. The meetings last year have been more frequent than in previous years; and the Society has furnished a platform for the presentation of the results of independent investigation, and has disseminated among the thinking public a truer and clearer idea of the province of the science and the point of view of society than had before been possible for them to acquire. It has been the desire of the Council and officers to secure the co-operation of the members at large in effecting this object, and I am persuaded that much may be done by the members to increase the influence and consequent usefulness of the Society in this respect.

9. *Eugenics.* In looking forward to the future, I have again to refer to two subjects in respect of which the action of the Society has been effective and will, it is hoped, be more so. Dr. Francis Galton's addresses to us on the subject of Eugenics have done much to awaken public interest in a question of the first importance. It matters little whether the nation is accumulating wealth or wasting its material substance compared with the risk that it is itself going backward, that it is reversing the law of the survival of the fittest, and adding to its numbers an ever increasing proportion of those who bring to it elements of weakness and not of strength: on the other hand, the early marriages of the stunted population of our large towns, producing offspring ill-fitted for the battle of life in disproportionate number and contributing largely to that excess of infant mortality to which Dr. Hutchison referred; on the other hand, the late marriages of the more thoughtful and provident members of the community, producing relatively smaller families, but under conditions more favourable to health of body, to soundness of mind, and to public usefulness. The scientific methods by which it may be made possible to add to the probable number of the better class and to check the undue multiplication of the lower elements, are the objects of Mr. Galton's inquiry, and we cannot be too grateful to him for the munificence with which he has endowed a Research Scholarship in Eugenics, from which good results may be expected. We are

also glad to welcome the Eugenics Education Society, over the Council of which our late excellent secretary, Dr. Slaughter, for a time worthily presided.

10. *Civics.* The other subject is that of Civics. So far as London is concerned, we have long had to deplore a certain want of local patriotism, which has been shown in the apathy felt by the majority of residents with regard to matters of local government. In this respect there has been undoubtedly some improvement of late years; but there is still much to seek. With all its faults, however, London has many merits. It is now a more beautiful city than I have ever known it to be before. The grand sweep of the new Whitehall, the opening up of Westminster Abbey by the removal of the houses in Old Palace Yard, and the range of splendid government offices along both sides of the widened street, are signs that the seed sown by Professor Geddes has fallen upon good soil. It is well that the inhabitants of all our great towns should feel a pride in their dwelling place that would induce them to preserve the relics of its history, to embellish it with stately and decorative buildings, and to cherish all open spaces and means and appliances for the health of the people.

11. *Organisation of Sections.* I understand that in connection with these two subjects and other branches of our work, a further step in advance is contemplated by your Council, and that sections are proposed to be organised for (1) Eugenics, (2) Civics, (3) Education, and 4) Social Economy or Social Life and Progress; to which possibly others may hereafter be added. The method of organisation will probably be to appoint for each an executive sub-committee and a sectional secretary, who will arrange for specialised sectional meetings and conferences, and will also take their share in working out the general programme of the society as it affects their section. By this means, it is hoped that the interest of many members of the Society at present outside of its council may be stimulated to work for its benefit, either by serving on these sectional committees or by contributing their special knowledge and aiding in its work of research.

12. *Education Section.* The section of Education is one from which, wisely directed, the best results may be expected. The heated political and religious controversies by which of late years the real interest and purpose of education have been obscured and diverted will lie wholly outside the view of this section. It will seek to bring back the public mind to the sole interest which the community as such has in the education of the young, viz., the preparation of the citizen for his conduct in life. Only by this means can the social inheritance be carried on from generation to generation; and only by the wise adjustment of the curriculum to the successive stages of fitness for life by which childhood passes into boyhood and boyhood into youth can the work be accomplished. For this adjustment scientific investigation and study are essentially necessary, and it is in the calm reasoning of the sociologist and not in the heated rhetoric of the religious or political controversialist that the nation will have to seek direction and inspiration.

13. *Social Economy Section.* The section of social life and

progress is equally one which in the present position of events may be expected to become an instrument of great value in placing before the public the real issues that are being presented to the legislature. We have just seen the beginning of a great experiment in social life, in the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908; and there are rumours that developments of similar experimental legislation in other directions are in contemplation. I do not here and now express any opinion on these actual and potential measures. I only repeat that all the questions which tend to modifications in social life and all the factors which make for progress may be better solved and ascertained in the calm atmosphere of scientific study than in the heated arena of political discussion.

14. *Election of Mr. F. Harrison.* I have, in conclusion, to congratulate the Society that the office of President for the coming year has been accepted by a sociologist of so much distinction as Mr. Frederic Harrison. By his eloquent advocacy of every movement tending to social progress, and his untiring labours for the public good, he has acquired a lasting claim on the gratitude of sociologists. Under his presidency, the continued and growing prosperity of the Society may be considered to be secure.

REVIEWS.

TALENT AND GENIUS.

"DIE ENTWICKLUNGSGESCHICHTE DES TALENTES UND GENIES." By Dr. Albert Reibmayr. Two vols. Munich: Lehmann, 1908.

THE author of this work is clearly a man of vigorous intelligence who has thought much concerning the origin and nature of genius and accumulated many miscellaneous opinions and facts. Although he approached the question (he tells us) from the medical side, he is not in the camp of those who regard genius as mainly a pathological phenomenon. He is rather to be classed with those investigators who, like Galton and Lorenz, regard intellectual ability as a quality that is bred by heredity through certain stocks. It is his main purpose to come closer to this argument, and to trace more precisely the process of the "developmental history" which finally results in the production of talent or genius. For the author's purpose it is important to define talent and genius; talent he regards as any degree of intellectual ability superior to the average, and genius as such superior ability combined with the aptitude of invention or creation. These definitions are as acceptable as such definitions usually are, so long as we make no attempt to apply them to particular cases, and Dr. Reibmayr wisely refrains from that attempt. The distinction is, however, of the first importance for the theory. Talent, the author believes, is produced by prolonged in-breeding, genius by cross-breeding. The conditions under which talent finally tends to appear are fully set forth. It is necessary that the race shall be fairly pure and well protected from racial admixture; this is effected by an insular position (as in the case of England), and still better by peninsular position (as in the case of Greece and Italy), or by abundant water-courses (as in the case of Mesopotamia and the Netherlands). A mild climate is also required. It is, further, highly desirable that the population should be largely engaged in agriculture and maritime commerce; the first supplies the basis of stolid "root-characters," and the second vivacity and imagination. The conditions which favour the production of talent also favour that of genius, for the seas or rivers which isolate a people are also eventually the means of introducing a foreign invading element which, on account of the difficulties to be overcome, is likely to be fairly small and select. The crossing of two races, each already highly in-bred and capable of producing talent, is the prime condition for producing genius. It is necessary that both peoples shall be superior, otherwise the mixture will produce results below and not above the level of the higher race. It is also necessary that there should be no extreme confusion of races of very various quality. That merely leads to "blood-chaos." Such blood-chaos is the cause why large cosmopolitan cities (like Rome), though they use up genius, do not produce it; it is also the main cause why so little genius has been provided in the United States. The best conditions are present

when with a predominantly in-bred people, caste, or family, a moderate stream of fresh blood is furnished from a similarly in-bred source of a racially related character. Many subsidiary arguments are also developed; much importance is, for instance, attached to the female line especially as carrying on the aptitude of an old race which has been overwhelmed by the invasion of a new race. The main contention is, however, that in the breeding of the higher human variations—genius and talent—the same laws of breeding rule as in Nature generally.

It is, without doubt, a reasonable conclusion, which few would undertake to deny. Unfortunately it cannot be said that the author has demonstrated it. He has devoted the greater part of his first volume to the erection of his elaborate superstructure of theory, announcing at the end that the detailed biological, biographical, and statistical facts which constitute the foundation would be brought together in the second volume. The arrangement scarcely seemed satisfactory, but it was necessary to suspend judgment until the second volume appeared. That volume has now been issued but it can scarcely be said that it fulfils the author's promise. It seems to consist in reality of *parerga* and *paralipomena*, and conspicuously fails to support Dr. Reibmayr's emphatic assertion that his investigation is scientific. There are a few tables, not of much value and not even all original; there are discussions of several important biological points, quite fruitless through the absence of methodically arranged facts, and there are throughout a vast number of quotations from Goethe, Emerson, Nietzsche, etc., but however interesting and even profound these quotations may be they do not constitute the useful bricks which the scientific builder requires. Unfortunately, although his reading is evidently miscellaneous and wide, the author is curiously ignorant of the attempts of various recent writers on a sounder and more precise basis. In an unsatisfactory section on the somatic characters of men of genius he states that the evidence, though vague, points to men of genius being below the average of their race in stature, and thereupon proceeds to build up theoretical explanations of this supposed fact, in ignorance that other writers, who have taken the trouble to inquire whether it is a fact, find that such difference as there is appears to be merely due to a greater variational tendency among men of genius. It is scarcely necessary to say that Dr. Reibmayr is ignorant of modern statistical methods. He has not even been able to profit by the example of those who have shown that in dealing with so vast a field as that of genius and talent it is necessary to specialise, and that the only sound method is to take a small part of the field, for instance a single country or even province, and to weigh and measure as accurately and impartially as may be, all the available facts within the region selected. He is not only unmethodical but uncritical and inaccurate even in regard to his small collections of definite data. Thus he speaks confidently concerning the race of Leonardo da Vinci's unknown mother, and he states that Cervantes was unmarried and had no child. Such statements concerning men of first-class genius inspire little confidence in Dr. Reibmayr's scanty data generally.

The author's best attempt to furnish a positive illustration of his main doctrines is to be found in the first volume and is embodied in a three-colour map of Germany. The colours correspond to a division of the country into three zones on the basis of their ability-producing power: (1) the zone of favourable mixture (left bank of Rhine with Netherlands, Baden, part of Bavaria and Southern Austria); (2) the zone of in-breeding

(right bank of Rhine with Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, Westphalia and Northern Bavaria); (3) the zone of first unfavourable and later favourable mixture (Prussia, Bohemia, Silesia, etc.). Dr. Reibmayr shows convincingly how the first zone, corresponding to the frontier of the Roman Empire, first furnished the conditions for the production of genius, how the second zone, inhabited by a sedentary and fairly unmixed population, produced the stolid Teutonic root-characters, while the third zone, depreciated at first by the invasion of a lower-grade population from the east, has gradually assumed an almost predominant position. Maps of Greece and Italy are also presented on a similar plan, but they are much less convincing, in the first case because the phenomena are too vague, and in the second because (as the author himself seems to have realised) they are too complex. It is amusing to note that Dr. Reibmayr has not escaped the weakness of the German anthropologist for finding in all the highest manifestations of genius outside Germany the concealed influence of German blood. It is true he is not prepared to go as far as Woltmann, who argued that all Italian genius is really German; Reibmayr admits that there are other elements, as indeed his theory requires. But he is strongly impressed by the resemblances between German genius and Greek genius, and thinks they can be accounted for by racial affinity. Refraining from any comment on the assumed similarity of Greek and German genius, one may be permitted to doubt whether anyone outside Germany has ever been struck by the resemblance of the Prussian to the voluble, vivacious, gesticulating Greek, as Cicero describes him.

If, confining his study to Germany, Dr. Reibmayr had also devoted more attention to soundness of method and to the preliminary accumulation and arrangement of data, it is possible that he would have produced a work of high value. Even as it is, however, these two volumes, though they contain many superfluous pages, should not be neglected by those interested in the fascinating problem of the determination of genius.

HAVELOCK ELLIS.

"FOLKLORE AS AN HISTORICAL SCIENCE." By George Laurence Gomme, with twenty-eight illustrations. London: Methuen & Co., 1908. 7s. 6d. net. Demy 8vo, 371 pp.

ONE of the objects Mr. Gomme had in writing this book was to rescue folklore from being submerged by the trivialities or waywardness of some of its adherents and to raise it to the dignity of a science. Others have drawn on the stores of folklore to illustrate stages in the evolution of religion and social conditions, but Mr. Gomme is more particularly concerned to show that the historian cannot afford to neglect the evidence of folklore, indeed he would go further and claim for folklore a recognised position in historical science.—"Historical records preserved from its past must necessarily be incomplete. An accident preserves one, an accident destroys another. An incident strikes one historian, and is of no interest to another. And it may well be that the lost document, the unrecorded incident, is of far more value to later ages than what has been preserved . . . After all that can be obtained from other realms of knowledge [geography, ethnography, economics, sociology, archæology], it is seen that there is a large gap left still—a gap in the heart of things, a gap waiting to be filled by all that can be learned about the thought, ideas, beliefs, conceptions, and aspirations of the people which have been translated for them, but not by them, in the laws, institutions, and religion which find their way so readily into history."

As illustrations of method, Mr. Gomme discusses the story of the pedlar of Swaffham and the relation of the incident to London Bridge, Hereward the Englishman in history and tradition, local names, and the like. "When once it is understood that traditions attaching to places and persons yield facts of a kind worth searching for, there will arise the desire to obtain all that is now obtainable from this source, and to add thereto the deductions to be drawn from their geographical distribution." But there many details in folklore which do not deal with historic personages, or relate to any one historic locality, but do relate to the peoples before personages and localities figured in their history, which will explain facts in culture-history rather than in political history. Of this proposition various examples are given by Mr. Gomme, the more interesting of which prove the large place assigned in certain folk-tales to important features of social institutions, for example: the non-relationship of father and daughter which often resulted in his marrying her, and the evidence for the killing of an old man after he had surrendered his property to his children. Folk-tales are analysed into three components: (1) The story radicles, or essential plot; (2) the story accidents, or illustrative points; (3) modern gloss upon the events in the story. Mr. Gomme also alludes to the fact that traditional law was handed down in a rhythmical form, but became prosaic when written down; and in dealing with the relation of folklore and religion, he gives the following well-timed word of warning: "the danger of searching for a general system of belief and worship from the beliefs and rites of peoples not ethnically, geographically, or politically connected is very great, and I venture to think that even Mr. Frazer's remarkable researches into the agricultural rites of European peoples do not take count of one important consideration . . . The plain fact is that the historical conditions have been altogether left out of consideration in these matters, and we consequently do not get a complete study. We get the advocate's position." Next Mr. Gomme deals with the treatment by historians of statements by classical writers as to the condition of the peoples inhabiting Britain before the dawn of civilisation. "Combined history and folklore can restore much of the picture of early times and can work through the fulness of later times with some degree of success." The problems "cannot be solved if history and folklore are separated."

In a valuable chapter on materials and methods Mr. Gomme defines Myth as primitive science and belief, and later as an explanation of a rite or ceremony. But, as Robertson Smith has explained, belief in a certain series of myths was not obligatory as a part of true religion; what was obligatory was the exact performance of certain sacred acts prescribed by religious tradition. The folk-tale is secondary to the myth; it is the primitive myth dislodged from its primitive place. It is told to children not to men. Thus while "the myth belongs to the most primitive stages of human thought, and is the recognisable explanation of some natural phenomenon, some forgotten or unknown object of human origin, or some event of lasting influence; and the folk-tale is a survival preserved amidst culture-surroundings, and deals with events and ideas of primitive times in terms of the experience or of episodes in the lives of unnamed human beings; the legend belongs to an historical personage, locality, or event." Mr. Gomme's formulation of methods of research deserve careful consideration. He draws attention to examples of belief or superstition which belong rather to psychological than to traditional influences. In

his chapter on "Anthropological Conditions," the author deals with some of the early phases of human society and with pygmy peoples as representing a low stage of culture, preliminary to a discussion of totemism. At the outset he denies that exogamy is an essential part of totemism. His first point is that totemism is, in its origin and principle, a kinless, not a kinship system. The next fact of importance is that as it commences at birth time, it must be closely associated with the mother and her actions as mother, from which he concludes that the search for the origin of totemism must be made from the women's side of the social group. He emphasises the necessity for separating totemism at its beginning from totemism in its most advanced stages. "Blood kinship is the destroyer, not the generator, of totemism, and we are therefore compelled to get at the back of blood kinship if we want to find totem beginnings." These Mr. Gomme believes are to be found in the Semang and he states, "In the case of the Semangs we have the kinless totemic belief and custom existing within a kinless society. In the case of the Arunta we have the kinless totemism existing in a society based on a kinless organisation still, but containing a full recognition of motherhood, and perhaps a recognition of physical fatherhood . . . There is nothing whatever to suggest that Semang totemism once possessed above it an elaborate social organisation of the usual totemic type." Totemism, *as usually defined*, does not occur among the Semang, and Mr. Gomme might, with advantage, have made it clear that in referring to Semang "totemism" he was not dealing with a totem cult, but merely with those myths, beliefs, and customs of the Semang which are analogous to those of other admittedly totemic peoples, but which in the case of the Semang it might be wiser to describe as belonging to 'incipient totemism.' After giving a formula for ascertaining the classification of savage beliefs and practices incidental to definite totemism, he discusses the survival of totemism in folklore.

"Perhaps the most important part of the anthropological aspect of custom, rite, and belief in tradition is sociological. Perhaps, too, it is the most neglected." Mr. Gomme draws attention to the invasion of Britain by tribal peoples and the distinction between the folklore derived therefrom and from the earlier conditions. "The arresting force of Christianity" is pointed out, "but its toleration has assisted in the preservation of pre-Christian belief and custom; but the preservation is in fragments only. The system which supported the older faith and might, if it had been allowed a natural growth, have produced a newer religion of its own, was completely shattered . . . Pre-Christian belief and custom has thus become isolated beliefs and customs in survival." Finally Mr. Gomme recurs to one of his earlier lines of research in seeking to dissect out, as it were, the racial elements in English folklore, his proposition being that "the history of the village community in Britain is the history of the economical condition of the non-Aryan aborigines; that the history of the tribal community is the history of the Aryan conquerors, who appear as overlords; and that the Romans, except as another wave of Aryan conquerors at an advanced stage of civilisation, had very little to do with shaping the village institutions of Britain." An endeavour has been made to give a general view of the purport of this stimulating book in the author's own words. Doubtless many of Mr. Gomme's inferences will be criticised by students, but all will admit that a sure foundation has been laid for the scientific study of folklore as a branch of history.

A. C. HADDON.

"A POOR MAN'S HOUSE." By Stephen Reynolds. London: John Lane, the Bodley Head. Pp. xi, 320.

WE are in an age which desires exact knowledge; and that desire, in its craving after satisfaction, takes many forms. It may find its fulfilment in long columns of statistics; it may see itself realised in an intricate chain of reasoning; or it may win its goal in a series of impressionist studies. Mr. Reynolds, in "A Poor Man's House," has selected the last of the three methods. Any one of the three deserves the epithet scientific, provided the result is an accurate picture of facts; but the third is the most difficult to carry through with success and at the same time the most tempting to adopt. It is very easy to make impressions, very hard to make them true. Mr. Reynolds's book belongs to the small number of true impressions, and may be classed with the writings of Miss Loane and of a few other authors who have looked into the life of the poor and contrived to produce composite photographs of what they have seen.

"In one respect "A Poor Man's House" is much superior to works of a similar kind; it possesses real literary merit. There are fine descriptions of natural phenomena, of a stormy sea, of a sunrise over the ocean, of the mystery that settles upon the waves when darkness falls; there are sketches of men and children, quaintly conceived and vividly drawn; and there is, pervading the whole, a spirit of tender humour and imaginative insight—characteristics which betoken artistic gifts of a high order and give to the book a charm beyond the common. The contents fall into two divisions, though in the composition the two are commingled. At one moment the author is painting for us the day's routine, telling us of the breakfast table and the noisy pack of healthy children, of mackerel and herring fishing, of the return of the fishing boats at dawn, and occasionally narrating some special event that breaks the even tenour of a fisherman's life. At another time he steps from the circle of those among whom his lot is cast, thinks over their doings as from the outside, and gives us certain conclusions as they remain impressed upon his mind. Both parts are integral portions of the book—the one standing for the facts and the other for the generalisations founded thereon;—and both witness in their treatment to a singular skill.

The author came, as he informs us, to the fisherman's house at Seacombe to gather material for fiction; he remained to tell the truth. He remained also because he liked the people and the, to him, novel form of existence. For the first time life was real; a return to the ordinary amenities of society filled him with infinite weariness and disgust: the society where people "chirp in lively or bored fashion, as the case may be, of the things that don't matter, of the ornamentations, the superfluities and the relaxations of life. At Tony Widger's they discuss—and much more merrily—the things that do matter: the means of life itself. . . . Here they laugh at trifles, keeping what is serious behind a veil of conventional manners, lest, appearing in broad daylight, it should damp their spirits. Then, they laugh too, and at countless trifles, but also courageously in the face of fate itself. By daring Nemesis they partially disarm her. With a laugh and a jest—no matter if it be a raucous laugh and a coarse jest—they assert: 'What will be, will be; us can't but do our best, for 'tis the way o'it.'"

What the author says is profoundly true; and it is the deepest lesson which those learn who come into intimate contact with the poor, unless, as happens often enough, they are destined never to learn anything, at all.

Whether in slum of town or village it is the same; not the discomfort, or the squalor, or the suffering; not the vulgarity, for, as Mr. Reynolds tells us, with the poor there may be coarseness but no vulgarity, unless they are struggling to climb the social ladder not from narrowness of outlook or the fierce fight for food or even the occasional outbursts of wild brutality are the things which rivet attention. But what comes home to us with all the startling surprise of a new revelation is the consciousness that life is real and significant. For the first time we are brought face to face with the three elemental facts of life—marriage and child-birth and death—in their undisguised nakedness. We are as men that have seen a ghost and the memory accompanies us back into the dim shadowland of polite society.

Having learnt this first and great lesson we are in a fit mood to study the poor. We remember that, as the author tells us, "the educated man has more to learn of the poor man than to teach him." We are more humble, less eager to do him good. The next lesson, almost a corollary of the first, lies in the discovery that, just as they are more vividly conscious of life's significance, so also are they, generally speaking, more capable of getting the best out of life. We may not go quite so far as the author and say "the poor have kept essentially what a schoolboy calls the better end of the stick," but we are driven to confess that "they know better how to make the most of what material circumstances they have."

The knowledge, he has acquired, renders the author less sure about the various panaceas for healing the evils of the poor. "The middle-class has become more and more the real lawmaker And the amusing and pathetic thing is that the middle-class has used its power to make other classes like itself." Mr. Reynolds is not particularly anxious to make the poor like the middle-classes; and Mr. Reynolds is probably right. "The two classes possess widely dissimilar outlooks. Their morale is different. The ethics are different The benevolent frequently accuse the poor of great ingratitude because, at some expense probably, they have pressed upon the poor what they themselves would like, but what the poor neither want nor are thankful for. The educated can sometimes enter fully, and even reasonably, into the sorrows of the uneducated, but it is seldom ended that they can enter into their joys and consolations." Much of the book is an illustration of this truth, in particular the parts which are concerned with children or with the recreations of the poor. In both there is the same overflow of exuberant spirits and a complete surrender to the enjoyment of the moment. Take the following as one among many examples:—

"Supper being pushed back on the table and a piece of wreckage flung on the fire, he made himself ready by taking off his soaked boots and stockings, and plumping his feet on Mam Widger's lap; then brought himself into the vocal mood with a long rigmarole that he used to recite with the mummers at Christmas time. Soon we were humming, whistling and singing "Sweet Evelina," whose sole musical merit is that her chorus goes with a swing. The fire crackled and burnt blue. The fragrant steam of the grog rose to the ceiling and settled on the window. We leaned right back in our chairs.

"Missis," said Tony, "I feels like singin' to-night."

"Wait a minute while I shuts the door, else the kids'll be down for more supper."

"Us got it, an't us!"

"Yes, but *they've* had enough."

When Tony sings, he throws his head back and closes his eyes, so that, but for the motions of his mouth, he looks asleep, even deathlike, and is, in fact, withdrawn into himself.

This picture illustrates at once the characteristic and serious manner in which the poor take their amusements and the graphic style of the author.

In all books of this kind there is a tendency, almost unavoidable, to read into the lives of the poor the feelings with which their lives inspire us. The present volume is not free from this fault; it appears very conspicuously in one chapter. The author is speaking of the hardships, the uncertainties and the perils which dog the steps of those whose earnings are precarious, and whose occupations are full of danger. The consciousness of this fact leads him to say that the chief characteristic of the poor is not the will to live but the courage to live. This is a signal instance of the fallacy mentioned above. The lives of the poor do seem to us courageous, even heroic, but to themselves they are nothing of the kind. Whatever else courage may involve, it does at least involve some dim consciousness of an ideal, such as stirs the heart of the common soldier when he is going out to battle. But with the poor there is no such consciousness of the ideal. William James, dealing with the same problem, writes with clearer insight: "The backache, the long hours, the danger, are patiently endured—for what? To gain a quid of tobacco, a cup of coffee, a meal, and a bed . . . This really is why we raise no monument to the labourers." For want of any ideal we have the appearance of courage without the reality, and so lose all the possibilities latent in this exhibition of ceaseless toil.

One curious omission in the book will be noted; there is no mention of religion or religious sentiment. Now if the author were concerned with only a single family this would not be strange, but he distinctly tells us that his conclusions "are founded not alone on this poor man's house." It would be incredible that persons who are in close communion with the elemental forces of life should be entirely untouched by any form of spiritual emotion; it is not only incredible, it is also untrue.

But of all classes the poor are the most reserved, and on all subjects the religious feelings are those they are least inclined to talk about, partly, no doubt, because they lack the necessary vocabulary. There are two stages in our relations with the poor. In the first, when we are strangers, they say, like children, what they think we should like them to say. In the second, as we grow more intimate, they say what they think, but only on such subjects as they believe we wish them to speak of. Perhaps this is the reason of the author's silence; he may not have been anxious to hear. But none the less the omission is serious; for religion, not indeed in a dogmatic form but in the shape of vague emotion, is one of the significant factors in their outlook on existence. It is, however, captious criticism to complain of omissions in a book in which so much is included and so excellently said.

REGINALD A. BRAY.

"STUDIES IN VENETIAN HISTORY." By Horatio Brown. 2 vols. John Murray. 1907.

SINCE Romanin died nearly fifty years ago no one has penetrated more deeply into the archives of the Frari or done more to reveal their treasures to the world than Mr. Horatio Brown. Interested alike in every period and every aspect of Venetian history, thoroughly acquainted with the

labours of other workers in the same field, and gifted with a sound judgment and an agreeable style, he is at all times assured of a welcome in and beyond the world of scholarship. Of the 20 essays which fill these volumes some are devoted to eventful incidents like the conspiracies of Tiepolo and Faliero, others to thinkers and scholars such as Contarini and Father Paul, others again to problems of administration and diplomacy.

Students of politics and sociology will naturally turn to the essays on the constitution and will desire to learn the author's judgment on the nature and results of Venetian rule. Disraeli's contemptuous comparison of the Whig aristocracy which governed England after the Revolution to the Venetian oligarchy is well known, and Mr. Brown points out in numberless passages that the astonishing stability of political life was purchased at the expense of liberty and individuality. In the essay on the Closing of the Great Council in 1296 we see how the oligarchy then established was driven to set up a dictatorship in order to maintain the ground that it had won. The Council of Ten, originally appointed to investigate the conspiracy of Tiepolo, its tenure of office being limited first to a few days, then 2 months, then 5 years, was finally declared permanent. "It was more terrible than any personal despot because impalpable, impervious to the dagger of the assassin, no concrete despotism but the essence of tyranny. To seek its overthrow was vain."

The impersonal nature of the Government was reflected in the life of its citizens, the heroic figures common in the earlier centuries tending to disappear when the constitution assumes its final form. "Venice demanded and secured the effacement of the individual, and impressed on one and all that the state was everything and the individual nothing." Little is known as to the personal life even of its greatest statesmen, who appear rather as the holders of office than as independent personalities. The noble ladies, again, lacked individuality, living in an Eastern seclusion, "as jealously shut away as the inmates of a Turkish seraglio." Nor was Venice conspicuous for freedom of thought. In the essay on the Censorship, a matter of unusual importance to a city with a flourishing book-trade, we follow the gradual triumph of the obscurantist teaching of the Counter-Reformation. The historic conflict between Sarpi and the Papacy and the braving of the interdict by the State were not the outcome of the intellectual or moral revolt but an assertion of the determination of the Republic to be mistress in her own house.

The essay on Commercial Policy throws light on a little known subject. The text-books attribute the decline of Venice to the opening up of the route round the Cape. Mr. Brown shows us how greatly this misfortune was intensified by a crazy fiscal policy. Poor in natural resources and depending for commercial success on the volume of distribution, the only chance of holding her own was to remove every obstacle to the free flow of goods. In 1662 the Senate repealed the import duty; but the stifling export duty remained, despite the protest of the Board of Trade. Long before Napoleon closed her thousand years of independent life, Venice had ceased to "hold the gorgeous East in fee," to produce great statesmen and artists, or to count among the forces of the modern world.

G. P. GOOCH.

"THE TAXATION OF THE LIQUOR TRADE." By Joshua Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell, M.P. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. Macmillan, 1908.

THE new edition of Rowntree and Sherwell's "Taxation of the Liquor Trade" brings the figures of 1906 up-to-date, and records recent legislation in the United States and the British Colonies, while in a supplementary chapter the authors reply to the criticisms directed by the Trade against certain of their contentions. The rejection of the Licensing Bill and the Time Limit makes the revision of the License duties inevitable, and gives a degree of actuality to the second edition which was not possessed by the first. Starting from the assumption that the universally acknowledged excess of licensed premises is due to a failure to apply the economic check of adequate taxation, the authors adduce additional evidence to shew that a considerable increase in the license duties can be easily borne by the Trade and is indeed recommended by the practice of our Transatlantic cousins.

The first charge with which the authors deal concerns the financial results of the substitution of a beer duty for the malt tax in 1880; the second challenges the contention that the liberty to use a variety of materials had rendered brewers more independent of fluctuations in the price of certain staple materials; the third qualifies the assertion that the cost of raw materials has fallen since the present scale of license duties was imposed 29 years ago. These technical objections, none of which affect the argument of the book, but which have been used to disparage its honesty and accuracy are answered without difficulty.

A question of wider interest and importance is raised by the criticism that the comparison between the license duties of England and the United States, which plays such a prominent part in the volume, is incorrect because incomplete. Broadly stated the contention is that though the duties are higher, the excise charges are lower and the retail price includes the free supply of seltzer water and the almost universal provision of free lunches, often of a substantial character, while the measures used differ in size. Thus the lower excise and higher selling price are in no real sense an offset against the enormous license duties, and the authors estimate that the Trade of Great Britain would have to be taxed from 7 to 13 millions extra before it bore an equal burden.

Two further questions remain to be answered. Since higher duties will reduce the number of places of sale, how can the revenue be expected to benefit? The authors reply that previous increases have had no such effect here or in America, and that there is no reason to believe that the point at which taxation would cease to be remunerative has yet been reached. The second question is as to whether increased taxation would be just. The answer summarises the arguments of the entire volume in a single paragraph. While other trades carry on their business under conditions of unrestricted competition, the liquor trade is a monopoly deliberately created and maintained by the State. In the next place it is concerned with a commodity which is admittedly a luxury, not a necessity. Thirdly, unlike all other trades, it entails on the community heavy expenditure in respect of its physical and moral effects.

It is hardly necessary to say that the authors eschew sensationalism and support their case by an overwhelming mass of reasoning and statistics. In its new form their latest volume will be more than ever welcome to social reformers and statesmen.

G. P. G.

"THE MAKING OF IRELAND AND ITS UNDOING: 1200—1600." By Alice Stopford Green. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1908.

THE Danish and still more the Anglo-Norman invasions injured but did not destroy the ancient Irish civilisation. The Anglo-Norman settlers, unsupported from England, found it easier to adopt Irish customs than to retain their own, and outside the Pale, were in a few generations merged in the mass of the people. They became, as the saying was, more Irish than the Irish. "'Rebels,' the Anglo-Irish were to English-born officials 'degenerate.' But to the Irish patriot all who lived in the common country owed, like other peoples, their first loyalty to the land that encompassed them with its skies, and fed them with the fatness of its fields, and nourished them with the civilisation of its dead." Mrs. Green has undertaken to trace the results of this amalgamation in the centuries that preceded the rise of the Tudor Monarchy and the ruin that followed the attempt to make English rule a reality in the sixteenth century. It is in some respects a difficult task, for the destroyers did not understand the civilisation they were so ready to subvert, and found it to their interest to paint it in the blackest colours; and the great poverty of Ireland during the last three centuries has made it difficult to believe that there ever was a period when the country, as judged by the standard of the time, had a flourishing commerce and industry. But though her task is difficult Mrs. Green has qualities well fitted for its accomplishment. She has deep sympathy and insight. To great industry in the collection of facts she adds no small skill in handling them. Above all, she has what many writers on Irish history lack, a wide knowledge of contemporary civilisations and institutions, so that she can treat the history of Ireland, not as isolated, but as a part of the general European evolution, modified by the peculiar circumstances of that country. Nowhere is the advantage of this more evident than in her treatment of the Irish towns; for their municipal institutions came from England, though they soon found a place in Irish life.

"From the history of the towns it is clear that the original English settlers, almost from the first generation, had been led by interest and intelligence to enter into the civilisation of Ireland, and become faithful citizens of their new land, united with its peoples, and devoted to its fortunes. Left to themselves, English and Irish joined in fruitful alliance, the English accepting Irish culture and jurisprudence, and enriching it with their own organisation of business and municipal laws. The picture of Galway, or indeed that of any other town, illustrates this fortunate union, by which civic prosperity was assured, the gaiety and urbanity of life enhanced, and a common net-work of interests spread over the country."

Every one of the chapters in this first part which deals with "Trade and Industries," throws a new light on the state of Ireland, its commerce, manufactures and agriculture, the relations of the towns to the clans and the final ruin of all together. The second part on Irish Education and Learning does not perhaps contain so much that is new. It is the story of an intelligent people with a strong intellectual tradition struggling desperately against adverse circumstances. The Irish love of learning has generally been recognised, but to persuade English or even Irish readers that Ireland once was rich, is a much more difficult task. Mrs. Green's facts, even allowing for an occasional mininterpretation, are really decisive. All the world was poor in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries judged by modern

standards; but the proportionate share of Ireland then was very different to what it is now. And, indeed, the particular evidence adduced by Mrs. Green far from leading to a paradox, is strictly in accordance with what might be expected from more general considerations. In those centuries of war, the country that had peace gained a great advantage; and compared with some other countries, Ireland enjoyed considerable security. Then and for long afterwards, owing to the difficulties of communication by land, water-carriage was the first necessity of trade; and Ireland was rich in havens and rivers. Industrial skill was not widely diffused in Europe at that period. This was the trader's opportunity. Given peace and safe harbours, an exchange of commodities quickly grew up. The profits of trade were large in comparison with the capital embarked. This situation, the Irish, like other nations, turned to advantage; but unlike other nations, they were not left to work out their own salvation and continue the course of their own evolution. Whether Ireland would have been equally successful under the industrial conditions of the eighteenth and nineteenth century is another question; but the continuity of development was broken, and the country had to face the new conditions in poverty and ignorance.

S. H. SWINNY.

"PROBLEMS AND PERILS OF SOCIALISM: LETTERS TO A WORKING-MAN."
By J. St. Loe Strachey, Editor of *The Spectator*. Macmillan's 6d. Series. 1908.

We are not sure that the form of letters to a correspondent, who does not himself appear, is the best in which to present views on Sociology to the public. There is an air of unreality about it. In the present instance, the first two (or three) of these letters were actually addressed to Mr. C. Harvey, of Bishop's Sutton, Somersetshire, without thought of publication, and appear to have been called for by two very able letters on Socialism contributed by him to the *Spectator*. The subsequent 18 (or 19) letters were prepared by Mr. Strachey for publication in that journal.

In the present instance the views of Mr. Harvey and of Mr. Strachey on the problems and perils of Socialism were in close agreement. Had it been otherwise, we should like to have seen both sides of the correspondence.

Whatever may be the value of this criticism as to matter of form, we cannot but acknowledge the service which Mr. Strachey has rendered by placing in the hands of the public a concise and clear statement of the grounds upon which the doctrines of Socialism that appears to be spreading among the working classes must be held to be fallacious and mischievous.

The condition of effective labour lies in the prospect of reward, in the certainty that by its means the labourer will be enabled to provide adequately for himself and those dependent upon him. The destruction of healthy competition in trade by municipalising or centralising commercial undertakings tends neither to efficiency nor to prosperity. The circulation of capital affords the best means of remunerative employment. Mr. Harvey knows Mr. Strachey well enough to believe that if he thought Socialism would cure the ills that make the world dark he would be a Socialist. He is convinced that it would make things infinitely worse. This is shown by the failure of the national workshops of 1848 in Paris. That failure was complete, although the working population were inspired by an enthusiasm for Socialism that is without parallel. State-supported

labour is everywhere costly. It is nevertheless a function of the State to see that no man or woman dies of starvation.

After enlarging on these topics, Mr. Strachey proceeded to discuss three present day proposals as Socialists—old-age pensions, the State feeding of school children, and the endowment of motherhood. Since he wrote, the first step towards the grant of old-age pensions on the scale he feared has been taken, and it remains to be seen whether in costliness, in vexatiousness, in injustice, and in unfairness, it will not realise all that Mr. Strachey has said against it. School feeding has also been established, but the unwillingness of some educational authorities to undertake a work which they consider should be left to private charity has retarded its general adoption. The endowment of motherhood by Act of Parliament has not yet been attempted.

Mr. Strachey stigmatises the old poor law as it existed in the first third of the nineteenth century as an almost complete Socialistic system and as a source of demoralisation. He seeks to make clear to his supposed correspondent the real meaning of value, the method of meeting the evils of sweating by freedom of contract, the danger of providing a reserve of surplus labour by means of State action, and the evil that is being done by the provision of relief for the unemployed. He holds that State Socialism is costly, and that the money to meet the cost will necessarily come out of the working-man's own pocket. He combats the Socialist paradox that labour becomes poorer the more it abstains and the more it saves; that temperance, thrift, and industry make labour an easier or more valuable prey to capital.

In conclusion, he deals with the question of national and municipal training, and points the moral to be drawn from the decline and fall of the Roman empire.

A poetic appeal to a Socialist friend by the Rev. R. H. Law is appended, which Mr. Strachey thinks to be spirited and happily expressed. In an easy and familiar style, Mr. Strachey has expounded a great number of economic truths, and his pamphlet, which is marvellously cheap, ought to have a wide circulation.

E. BRABROOK.

"RELIGIONS, MOEURS, ET LÉGENDES, ESSAIS D'ETHNOGRAPHIE ET DE LINGUISTIQUE. Par Arndt van Gennep. Paris: Société du Mercure de France, 1908.

M. VAN GENNEP is well-known to his brother-anthropologists as a thoroughly competent student of the lower culture, his respect for scientific method being no less noteworthy than his wide acquaintance with the literature of his subject. Hence even his more ephemeral productions are bound to contain much that must prove valuable to the expert. One might instance the paper entitled *Le Rite de Refus*, or indeed the greater part of the section devoted to linguistic questions, as work which, despite its occasional form, constitutes an addition to the permanent fabric of the science. It is probable, however, that the author in re-issuing these twenty-three articles, most of them apparently reviews of books, had before his eyes the needs of a wider public. As he says—and every reader of the *Sociological Review* is likely to agree with him here—the world is beginning to perceive that it is bad method to isolate some one group of social phenomena without taking into account the other groups. The

system of "water-tight compartments" has had its day. Anthropologists, archaeologists, technologists, philologists, and so on, no longer ignore one another's researches, but are anxious to co-operate in the hope of obtaining a deeper insight into the ways in which the various social factors interact. To those sociologists, then, whose main interest lies outside anthropology, but who are nevertheless anxious to keep in touch with its latest findings, this book may be specially recommended. Suppose such persons to seek light in regard, say, to taboo or totemism, they will receive from M. van Gennep, if not a systematic account of the subject, at all events a very suggestive sketch of it, and that from the severely critical point of view. Lastly, it may be noted that constant reference is made to the leading authorities, so that any reader bent on following up a clue will be helped on his way.

R. R. M.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

REPORT OF AN INQUIRY BY THE BOARD OF TRADE INTO THE COST OF LIVING IN FRENCH TOWNS [Cd. 4512].

This report completes the investigation undertaken by the Board of Trade into the cost of living of the working classes in England [Cd. 3864], Germany [Cd. 4032] and in France [Cd. 4512]. Perhaps the chief interest of such an investigation, from the point of view of England, arises from the possibility of a comparison with Germany and France. Part II of both the later reports deals exclusively with this side of the question, and the results have inevitably been drawn into the Fiscal controversy. The late Mr. Wilson Fox, in his prefatory note to the German Report, insisted upon the difficulties and ambiguities attendant upon a comparison of this nature, and he considered it necessary to repeat the warning in the preface to the latest volume. The qualifications that must be borne in mind, relate, he says, to "differences in national tastes and modes of life," to the kind and quality of the articles compared by their price, and to the kind of accommodation compared by rent.

It is assumed (1) that an average British working man with an average family goes to live in France and retains as far as possible his accustomed mode of life, and (2) that an average French family comes to England under the same conditions. Taking prices as ruling in the two countries, in October, 1905 (when the investigation was started), it is calculated that in the first case the Englishman's expenditure would increase 18 per cent.—half of this amount being due to the higher price of coal and half to the increased cost of food—whereas in the second case the Frenchman's expenses would have fallen 6 per cent. In comparing the weekly Budgets, many articles, and those by no means unimportant ones, have been omitted, such as tea, eggs and vegetables, for which it was found impossible to get comparative prices. When rent, which in France is lower than in England, is inclined in the calculation the expenditure of the English workman living in France would rise 14 per cent. instead of 18 per cent. The underlying assumption that the foreign families would "retain their accustomed mode of life" under entirely different conditions, or that, if prices rose in England to the level ruling in France in 1905 no re-adjustment would be made in the different items of expenditure, is an entirely arbitrary one, and the warning contained in the preface needs to be borne in mind with regard to every point. A comparison of certain details is, however, both possible and interesting.

Rent. Compared with England, the standard of house accommodation is inferior in France, even when account has been taken of the smaller size of French families. Whereas in England, the largest number of houses occupied by the working classes consist of four rooms, in France the largest number consist of two rooms. This is the more remarkable as rents for similar accommodation are 2 per cent. lower in France than in England.

Budgets. A comparison of the family budgets shows that a less percentage of the family income is spent on food in France than in either England or Germany. This is partly accounted for by the smaller size of the French family. The French meat diet is much more varied, and includes veal, charcuterie and poultry, in addition to the beef, mutton, pork and bacon of England and Germany. The French family with an income of 25/- and 30/- spends 7 per cent. on vegetables—other than potatoes—as against the 4 per cent. of the English family, and all the way up the scale of incomes the proportion is greater.

Wages and Hours. The comparison of nominal wages and hours of labour between England and France is based on only three trades—building, engineering, and printing. Allowing for all the necessary qualifications, it is evident that within the limits of the comparison, the average hours of labour in France are 17 per cent. higher than those in England. Since the weekly average of wages is in the ratio of 75 to 100 the hourly earnings are about two-thirds of the English ones. In any discussion of the bearing of international labour legislation upon international competition, this question of lower wages and longer hours looms large. It is interesting to note in this connection that, although the German labourer works longer hours for a lower hourly rate of money wages than the Englishman, the French labourer could beat them both, if these were the determining factors in international competition.

D. SHENA POTTER.

SPECIAL REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL SUBJECTS.

Vol. 22: Provision made for Children under School Age in Belgium, France, Germany, and Switzerland, 1909 [Cd. 4477].

The most casual glance into this report is enough to convince eugenicist and sociologist of the vast field open to future labour. We in England have only as yet begun to care for the children, and here is the result of personal inquiry into the efforts made by other countries, and specially by Belgium, France, Germany, and Switzerland. We are shown in detail the working of their day-nurseries (*crèches*, *Krippen*), Kindergartens and infant-schools (*écoles maternelles*, *Kleinkinderschulen*). Many essays are in embryo here. For example: the freedom of private management is by some observed to favour the best development of these institutions; practically all originated with philanthropic and specially religious philanthropic bodies (we are not, of course, referring to the *fons et origo*, Oberlin's Kinderbewahranstalt in 1779 and Froebel's Kindergarten in 1837, but to the various institutions that rapidly followed on the first Paris *crèche* of 1844); the day-nurseries form excellent training schools for nurses in private families and the various forms of infant-school as good opportunities for the preparation of Kindergarten teachers; in some a suggestive course of hygiene has been held for the older children of workpeople. There is a wide variation in detail from entirely private to entirely municipal or state management, from absolutely free to varying daily payments; food and clothes are provided in some, baths in others; inspection is private, municipal, or state. But the whole subject needs careful consideration, and in time perhaps English men and women will find out the forms of *crèche* and Kindergarten most suitable to the English child temperament. At present we are shown to be distinctly behind the best continental developments. In Belgium the characteristic note is the almost universal addition of the *école-gardienne* to the *crèche*, so carrying on the help given to parents and child for another three years. Speaking roughly, Belgium accommodates half of its children between the ages of three and six. Liège excels: all its institutions are controlled by the Commune. The *dames patronnesses* are only second in their zeal to those who superintend the Paris *crèches*. In both France and Belgium immense stress is laid on hygiene, and it is in this respect too that English institutions compare unfavourably with theirs. In numbers we fall badly behind. London with her huge working population has 55 private *crèches*: Paris has 68 with 44 in the suburbs. Outside London 19 *crèches* exist, outside Paris 322! France is indeed the home of the *crèche*, and other countries have copied her models. Germany lays special emphasis in her various infant-schools on the need of special training for the care of young children, and with her most modern buildings for these institutions we have nothing that can in any way compare. But the report deserves to be read in detail. An interesting appendix deals with the case of young children in foreign countries and British colonies: this material was collected by the Froebel Society and as it consists of purely written testimony it is of course of only limited value.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF PRISONS AND THE DIRECTORS
OF CONVICT PRISONS.

(For the Year ended 31st March, 1908.)

There is evidence here of much good intention and well-meant effort, though doubtless one must make some discount for the general tendency of official reports to say smooth things. There is, nevertheless, plenty of evidence in these pages that we have not in this country any well-thought-out system for the reclamation of criminals. The beginnings of an attempt at a reformatory system are, however, being built up, with some enthusiasm, for junior-adult male offenders (between the ages of 16 and 21). This is a decided improvement on the ordinary prison régime, and seems to show promise of some success. But it is well to remember that, even when it is improved as provided by the Prevention of Crime Bill now before Parliament, it will still fall very far short of methods applied to first offenders between the ages of 16 and 30 in State Reformatorys, and to other and older offenders in State Prisons, in some of the States of North America. Still, we must be thankful for real improvements when we get them, as we seem to in this case, and hope for better still to come.

With regard to adult offenders, there is also record of much devotion and effort and of many and continuous little improvements. Lady visitors have been organised for women's prisons. Only this last year a lady doctor has been appointed as Inspector. Trade instruction seems to be gradually better organised. Lighting, drainage, and other important details are being slowly improved. Obscure glass is being replaced by clear glass as funds and opportunity permit. There are also lectures and even concerts; though they seem rather to be added as humanitarian extras than as having a natural place in the system.

But how is it possible to have a satisfactory system of reclamation when commissioners have to report, as they do on p. 26, "the difficulty to which we referred in our report of last year of finding useful industrial employments for prisoners, owing to a shorter supply of orders from other Government departments, continues"? The orders apparently have to be begged, for where they can be got without reference to the educative nature of the occupation they may or may not provide. The General Post Office is described (p. 43) as "our sheet anchor in the matter of prison employment," because of the large number of mail bags it orders. Apart from other considerations surely all this unpaid labour—slave labour it might be called—is rather demoralising.

In a most interesting passage the Commissioners quote Mr. Grant-Wilson (pp. 14-15) as pointing out "a great defect in our social system, viz., the absence of any plan whereby lads leaving the elementary schools, perhaps with good character and good ability, can be diverted into the paths of permanent employment, skilled or unskilled, instead of being left, as they are, to take their chance in the labour market to earn what few shillings they can by casual jobs, and, in many cases, to drift, from lack of superintendence or interest in their work, into idle and loafing habits—the breeding ground of criminal propensity."

On p. 33, Dr. Smalley, the Medical Inspector, considers an analysis he has made (Appendices, pp. 138-145) of 1,334 prisoners certified insane during ten years, whom he classifies according to their crimes. The analysis seems to confirm current ideas as to "the predominance of crimes of acquisitiveness in the delinquency of the general paralytics, and of homicidal crime in that of the epileptics," but seems to contradict current theories in showing a small total of epileptics.

Another serious social defect appears in the report on pp. 48-9 by the Inspector under the Inebriates Acts on State Inebriate Reformatorys, where he complains that "there is no power to detain the most hopelessly defective person after sentence has expired."

The unsatisfactory provision for discharged prisoners—unsatisfactory because insufficiently supported, disjointed and inadequate—is plainly seen from the Chaplain-Inspector's report on Aid Societies (pp. 46-7), though he tries to put a good face on it. He has tried to find out the prisoner's point of view, and says:—"Setting aside the preference expressed by a somewhat numerous section of too-candid souls for a lump sum down—aid bestowed in hard cash without conditions—I have found the judgment of prisoners quite sound and rational, particularly in the case of convicts. They deprecate 'indiscriminate doles' just as vigorously as does the Charity Organization Society. 'Let the Societies,' they say, 'direct their whole endeavours to getting us work of some kind, and giving us something like a fresh start, and let the money go towards maintenance until that end is attained.'"

To sum up the general impression, it is something like that of a number of pieces of cloth of different sizes and shapes cut out but not yet sewn together into a garment. And one is inclined to doubt whether the pieces would fit together if the attempt were made—to say nothing of their chance of fitting the person for whom they might be supposed to be intended.

REPORT OF THE INDIAN FACTORY LABOUR COMMISSION, 1908.

This report is an important sign of the times and of their changes in India, for it presents a summary of the conditions of labour at any early stage of an industrial revolution, some of the factors of which have been briefly referred to in the note on the "Statistical Abstract."

While agriculture directly engages fully three-fourths of the population, and until recently industrial progress has been slow, it remains that to-day nearly 1½ million persons are employed in factories, coal-mines and other undertakings founded chiefly with European capital or conducted on European methods. There are many signs that the native distrust of joint-stock enterprise is giving way under the example thus set.

About 20 years ago the first Factory Act sought to regulate the working hours of women and children, but it made no provisions in the case of male adults, save as regards a compulsory interval for rest in the middle of the day and for holidays on Sundays. Evasions of the law are frequent; in many textile factories the men have often worked daily for 14 to 15 hours over considerable periods. Yet it is agreed that the present system is wasteful and deleterious. Experiments have shown that the gross product of a 12 hours' working-day is equal to and even greater than that of a longer period. No direct evidence of physical deterioration was established, but then the data are wanting, owing to the fluid nature of the factory population, which is constantly changing as the operatives move from mill to mill or retire to their homes for rest: but this fact is of itself suggestive of unendurable strain, when the much better wages obtainable in the mills are taken into account. It is, further, notable that the results of the comparison of the body-weights of the men with those of adult prisoners were, in all provinces, found to be unfavourable to the former.

A few points deserve notice: No trade unions have been formed, though successful strikes have occurred; and while in favour of legal restrictions on the working hours, the operatives cannot, individually, resist excessive hours when aided with increase of pay. Then a large number, possibly the majority, have interests in the land in their native villages, which they can leave to the care of relatives, under the joint-family system, and to which they can return at any time with their savings. This gives them independence, and under the conditions of a rising demand for labour, they are thus able to obtain concessions for working in their own way. As regards the relative cost and efficiency of labour in England and India there is an interesting statement. A cotton-mill in Madras with 35,000 spindles and 800 looms, working 67½ hours a week, employs 2,622 operatives; whereas a similar mill in Lancashire,

working 54½ hours, would require 982 hands; i.e., a proportion of 262 Indian to 1 English hand. But, as the average monthly wage of the latter may be put at £4, while that of the Indian at £1, it appears that the Indian millowner gets nearly double the work for the same outlay. To this may be added the statement that the general rate for the board and lodging of an operative in Bombay amounts to about Rs. 6 (8s.) per mensem, which, however, is considerably more than would be required outside a presidency town.

After a full discussion of the issues the Commissioners do not recommend any direct restriction of the working-hours of adult males, but their agreements are discussed ably and, to a large extent, discounted, in a minute of dissent by one of the members. They recommend further regulation of the hours of women and children, and of young persons, and trust to the indirect effect of these restrictions on the working-day of the adult male. From the evidence presented, however, it would appear that by a modification of the working arrangements this anticipation may easily be frustrated.

THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON HUMAN AND ANIMAL TUBERCULOSIS.

This report affords definite confirmation of results already obtained in Germany (1899) and in America (1907), dissipating all doubt as to the infectiveness of milk derived from cows in which, while the udder remains unaffected, there is more or less clinical evidence of internal tuberculosis. But beyond this, evidence is adduced to show that even apparently healthy animals reacting to the tuberculin test (which is held to substantiate the presence of the disease when not otherwise demonstrable) may, and do, discharge the specific bacilli in the intestinal evacuations. In consideration of the impossibility of avoiding excremental contamination of milk under the conditions which prevail in dairy operations, the danger of infection to which consumers of milk, especially children, are liable is obvious. Moreover, the German and American observers have detected the actual presence of the bacilli in the milk of a very large proportion of the cattle examined, the only sign of the disease in which was the reaction to the tuberculin test. Farmers have hitherto contended that patent disease of the udder should be the test of infectiveness and they were not without the support of some authority for this view which must now be abandoned. In face of the very extensive prevalence of tuberculosis among cattle in this country, the task of formulating administrative measures for the protection of the public is a serious one; but the system initiated by Professor Bang appears to have realized good results in Denmark and elsewhere. It consists in (1) the application of the tuberculin test to entire herds; (2) the complete and permanent separation of all reacting from non-reacting animals; and (3) the gradual rearing of a healthy stock from the infected members, by separation of all calves born to these from the hour of birth, and by feeding the calves with non-tuberculous milk.

THE WEEKLY REST-DAY.

REPORTS from His Majesty's Representatives abroad as to legislation in foreign countries respecting a weekly rest-day. (Miscell. No. 3, 1909.)

Following upon a debate in the House of Lords on the second reading of the Weekly Rest-day Bill, the Foreign Office sought information as to similar legislation in other countries. The results of the inquiry here published furnish evidence of much diversity in the regulations adopted by European nations during recent years. The oldest law referred to in the Report as making a weekly rest-day compulsory is, apparently, that of Holland. It was passed in 1889 and is concerned mainly with

the observance of Sunday in factories. France adopted in 1906 the principle of one full day of rest in the week, the day being Sunday wherever possible. It is stated that the law has been officially enforced, with results which are quite evident to the most superficial observer of French life. It is popular among the working classes, but there was at first a supposition that the lower *bourgeoisie* were opposed to it. In Germany, under the Trade Regulations of 1900, workmen cannot be forced to work on Sundays except in specified cases. Italy in 1907 adopted legislation, of a more or less experimental character, the weekly rest-day not necessarily being Sunday. Sunday labour is prohibited in factories in Austria and Switzerland, and in the former country Sunday trading is, with exceptions, not permitted for more than four hours. The law provides for the compensation of employees who have to undertake necessary labour on Sundays. Belgium enforces a half-day rest in certain industries, and no employer can compel any of his employees to work on Sunday, unless they are domestic servants or members of his own family. Sweden has no legislation on the subject, and none of the United States has yet enacted laws interfering with the Sunday labour of male adults.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

ECONOMIC JOURNAL. Vol. xix, No. 73.—This number contains two papers read before the British Association last year, both of which relate to subjects of immediate interest. Mr. R. L. Wedgwood discusses the Statistics of Railway Costs. He analyses the recent returns of traffic and receipts, and contends that a more scientific statistical system than that at present in vogue is attainable. Mr. H. W. Macrosty submits proposals for an economic survey of the United Kingdom. After noting the gulf that exists between the academic economist and the facts of the industrial universe, he urges as the economist's immediate duty the temporary abandonment of speculation in favour of a systematic endeavour to ascertain all the facts, more especially those facts of custom and tradition tending to modify "the consequences which would naturally follow from the unrestrained influence of supply and demand." His suggestion is that the scope of the survey having been determined upon, advisory committees should be formed for each of the trade groups selected for investigation, such as committees providing the investigators with the necessary facilities for carrying out their researches. Here, in Mr. Macrosty's view, is a fruitful field for post-graduate study. Dr. Jacques Dumas considers the present state of the land system in France, and Professor Bastable that of the same question in Ireland. Mr. J. M. Keynes, under the heading of *Recent Economic Events in India*, examines a subject which calls for much closer attention on the part of western economists than it has so far aroused, namely, the continual rise in the price of food stuffs in India and the fall in the food purchasing power of the rupee.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS. Vol. xix, No. 2.—Prof. J. S. Mackenzie, in a brief appreciation, states his opinion that the late Dr. Edward Caird has built up a solid treasure-house of wisdom that will outlast many more showy erections: "in breadth of knowledge, balance and judgment, maturity of insight and power of luminous expression, he was probably without a peer." Summing up the ethical influence of the late Friedrich Paulsen, Prof. F. Thilly says: "He was the child of a hardy, frugal, clear-headed and warm-hearted seafaring race, and he gave philosophical expression to the ideals of a stock from which so many intellectual leaders of the old fatherland have sprung, and upon the integrity of which the future glory of Germany must depend." Prof. M. E. Sadler discusses the salient features of last year's International Congress on Moral Education. Mr. A. W. Benn continues his criticism of Nietzsche's ideas in *The Morals of an Immoralist*. Other articles are—H. H. Schroeder: *Self-esteem and the Love of Recognition as Source of Conduct*. W. M. Urban: *The Will to Make-believe*. Carl Heath: *Crime and Social Responsibility*.

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS. Vol. xxiii, No. 2.—Joseph Schumpeter: *On the Concept of Social Value*. Argues that the concept of social value, which indispensable in the study of a communistic society, may be usefully introduced, by way of a scientific fiction, in the study of non-communistic society, though in this case it cannot be accepted as a fully satisfactory statement of the facts. W. E. Lunt: *The Financial System of the Mediæval Papacy in the Light of Recent Literature*. The remaining articles are on purely fiscal subjects.

THE YALE REVIEW. Vol. xvii, No. 4.—The editor gives a negative answer to the question, Are American economists wasting their time? F. R. Fairchild: *The Economic Problem of Forest Taxation*. T. H. Boggs: *England's Problem in India*. Discusses the present unrest from a standpoint sympathetic with the administration. H. H. S. Aimes: *Courtacion*—a Spanish institution for the advancement of slaves into freedom.

MONIST. Vol. xix, No. 1.—Pragmatism fills a considerable place in this number, the chief of three articles on the subject being a psychological analysis of William James by Edwin Tausch. J. H. Leuba: *The Psychological Origin of Religion*. E. Montgomerly: *A Dialogue between an Idealist and a Naturalist*.

MONATSSCHRIFT FÜR SOZIOLOGIE, Leipzig. Januar, 1909. Geleitwort.—Eleutheropulos: *Die Bedeutung der Soziologie im Systeme der Wissenschaften*. The importance of sociology lies in the pre-eminent value of the object of sociological knowledge. Discussion of the reaction of sociology on political, juridical, economic, and historical science, and on general philosophy. *Was ist das Objekt, bezw. die Aufgabe der Soziologie?* i. *L'Objet de la Sociologie, par René Worms*. Distinction between science and art; the former only studies social phenomena, the latter endeavours to modify them. ii. *Quelle est la tâche et l'objet de la sociologie? par Achille Loria*. Sociology depends for its existence on the several social sciences, which it in turn co-ordinates.) iii. The Status of Sociology, by Lester Ward. Sociology a science like any other, having for its object a natural phenomenon. Ferdinand Toennies: *Comtes Begriff der Soziologie*. Denies scientific value to Comte's sociological work. *Bericht über die soziologische Literatur seit 1900 und die soziologischen Gesellschaften*: a. *Einiges über die neueste soziologische Literatur und deren Hauptrichtungen in Italien*. Account of the development of the social sciences in Italy since 1900; especial importance is attached to the work of Pareto and Pantaleoni.) b. *Die soziologische Gesellschaft in Wien.—Aus angrenzenden Wissensgebieten: Der Stammbaum des rezenten Menschen*, by Eleutheropulos. Account of recent anthropological studies and discoveries.

Februar, 1909. Max Heinze: *Die Rassenfragen bei Platon und Aristoteles*. Plato and Aristotle only distinguished psychological racial differences; they differentiated Greek from Barbarian, and three distinct classes from each other within the Hellenic community. *Was ist das Objekt, bezw. die Aufgabe der Soziologie?* i. Ferdinand Toennies: *Die Aufgabe der Soziologie*. The specific study of sociology is human cohabitation. ii. A. Vierkandt: *Objekt und Aufgabe der Soziologie*. Distinguishes three conceptions of the object of sociology. *Die Soziologie in Frankreich seit 1900, von R. Maunier*. Account of the development of the social sciences in France, and of the important work accomplished by Durkheim and his school. *Soziale Verhältnisse und Philosophie, Streifzüge durch die Geschichte der Philosophie*. L. Wilser: *Bemerkungen zu dem Aufsatz "Der Stammbaum des rezenten Menschen"*. A reply to the paper of Eleutheropulos in the January number. *Kleine Rundschau: Selbstanzeigen*. A review of two recent books of A. Böhtlingk and A. Vierkandt, by the authors.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR SOCIALWISSENSCHAFT, Leipzig. Februar, 1909.—A. Gottstein: *Die Entwicklung der Hygiene im letzten Vierteljahrhundert*. Describes the difference in the evolution of academic and empirical hygienic methods in Germany. A. Mayer: *Zur Frauenfrage, II*. Criticism of the theories of leaders of the feminist movement. Martin Lindsay: *Gegenwartserfahrungen und Zukunftsaussichten des Sozialismus in den vereinigten Staaten*. Discusses the causes of the failure of the Socialist political movement in the United States. W. Muench: *Volk und Schule Preussens vor hundert Jahren und heute*.

März, 1909.—A. Oncken: *Adam Smith und Adam Ferguson*. Denies the claim to priority made on behalf of Ferguson by Karl Marx. E. Schultze: *Landunterschleife in den Vereinigten Staaten*. Account of land speculation and frauds in the United States. A. Mayer: *Zur Frauenfrage, III*. Rosenthal: *Ist Alkohol ein Nahrungstoff?* Denies alcohol any nutritive value, but admits that it can have under certain conditions medicinal value.

REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE, Paris. Janvier, 1909. R. Garofalo: *De la Solidarité des nations dans la lutte contre la criminalité*. Advocates the creation of an international code of penal procedure, with a view to a more rapid extradition of criminals. G. Benoit-Lévy: *Un Institut de Service Social en France*. *Société de Sociologie de Paris. Séance du 9 décembre 1908: la femme de lettres. La vie sociale au théâtre*, J. Lortel.

RIVISTA ITALIANA DI SOCIOLOGIA. Anno xii. Fasc. vi.—V. Miceli: *Le Leggi di associazione mentale in diritto*. Significance of psychological relations in social control. In primitive societies recognized resemblances are superficial and restricted, but development coincides with the appreciation of qualities potentially common to humanity. Mental inertia contributes to the importance of association by analogy, apparent in custom, authority and symbolism, while analogy also serves to extend the sphere of law. The effect of association by contrast is double-edged; it both defines differences and indirectly promotes solidarity by the suppression of egoistic tendencies in the group. G. de Sanctis: *Questioni di storia e di critica*. The writer defends theories advanced in his *Storia dei Romani* against the attacks of Prof. Bonfante. The controversy turns on questions relating to the Aryan race and language, the origin of the Etruscan people, Roman law and institutions. P. Bonfante: *Questioni di critica storica*. A reply to the preceding article. As a jurist the writer especially criticizes the view of a legal Graeco-Italian unity.—P. S. Leicht: *Un movimento agrario nel cinquecento*. An account of a rising of the *minuto popolo* of town and country in the Friuli. In spite of its failure, the Venetian Republic prevented the nobles from exacting over harsh reprisals by granting the peasants separate parliamentary representation.

RIVISTA INTERNAZIONALE DI SCIENZE SOCIALI E DISCIPLINE ANSILIARIE. Vol. xlix. Fasc. cxciv.—Raffaele Guariglia: *La Concorrenza del lavoro Straniero nei paesi d'Europa*. Describes the position of the foreign workman in various European countries—his relation to the native population, his liability to taxation and to summary expulsion (e.g., in Switzerland). In Austria the difficulty is racial rather than economic. Everything points to the need for a scientific industrial organization, international rather than national. Emilio Pesci: *Gli interessi morali della religione e della famiglia nel Centralismo federale Svizzero*. The new civil code maintains the existing religious settlement, i.e., the religious autonomy of each canton. It extends the right of divorce to cases of incurable insanity and serious incompatibility of temper. P. Aurelio Palmieri: *Le dottrine religiose dei Mariavite polacchi*. On the religious side, this sect rebels against the authority of Pope and bishop, while its political sympathies are with Pan Slavism. Pietro Pisani: *L'Agricoltura nel Canada Centrale*.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE FUTURE OF LONDON GOVERNMENT.

On Monday, February 8, in the hall of the Society of Arts, John Street, W.C., Dr. Gilbert Slater delivered a lecture on "The Future of London Government," Mr. J. Laurence Gomme presiding.

Dr. SLATER said that from one point of view London might be described as a city denied civic rights. The governmental unit was the County of London, the London County Council being a statutory authority possessing no general municipal rights, while the Corporation of the City, which did possess such rights, governed only one square mile of the whole metropolitan area, and the powers of the metropolitan borough councils were more restricted than those of an ordinary urban district council. From another point of view London was not a city at all, but a province, comprising, besides many urbanized villages, two ancient cities, several ports, and market and manufacturing towns. London had grown, not like Paris by continual expansion from one centre, but by coalescence; and the area inhabited by Londoners was administered as a fortuitous concourse of boroughs, county boroughs, and metropolitan boroughs, and urban and rural districts. London, with regard to population, consisted of a series of roughly concentric rings; in the central area the resident population had been decreasing since railways had time to influence the choice of habitation; in the second ring population had begun to decrease within the last decade; in the third ring it was still increasing, though slowly; in the fourth ring population was increasing with enormous rapidity. But the fourth ring was almost entirely outside the county area. The County of London was a diminishing fraction of the true London. A satisfactory reform of London Government must recognize (1) the dominant present fact of London's civic unity; (2) the dominant tendency of London's expansion. A City Council for Greater London was therefore indicated. By Greater London was meant that area in which the population consisted mainly of (a) workers whose employment was in London, and their dependents, and (b) local shopkeepers and others whose work was directly or indirectly for the service of class (a). This was a continually expanding area, and the corresponding governmental limits should also be elastic. By City Council was meant a Council possessing (a) the general municipal power of taking action for the common well-being of the citizens, (b) the specific powers of dealing with city services exercised by provincial cities of Great Britain, (c) powers of inspection and supervision over the local authorities of London. But if the need of a City Council for Greater London was admitted, the necessity for a considerable degree of local self-government for existing boroughs and districts followed as a practical corollary. It would be dangerous to diminish the responsibilities of these local authorities; because diminished responsibility would naturally tend to produce decay and corruption. For this reason proposals for equalisation of rates should be made to harmonise with real local financial responsibility. If rating were dealt with as a special London problem, reform should be on the principle of the Eualisation Rate. On the other hand the boroughs and districts might well be called upon to undertake important duties in regard to education and such health administration as has hitherto fallen to Boards of Guardians. The efficiency of London local authorities should be increased by (a) adult suffrage, (b) the recognition of day residence as a voting qualification, (c) proportional representation. True municipal councils for London boroughs were the second desideratum for the reform of London Government. "Ad hoc" authorities, if retained,

should be regarded as merely temporary expedients. While experience had justified the principle of one local authority for a given district for all local purposes, it had also proved that state control should be exercised through several specialised departments, and not concentrated in one. The Local Government Board should be abolished, and Ministries of Labour and Public Health constituted. Parliamentary procedure also needed to be raised to the municipal level of efficiency.

PRESENT TENDENCIES OF CLASS DIFFERENTIATION.

On Monday, February 22, at 24 Buckingham Street, W.C., Mr. F. G. D'aeth read a paper on "Present Tendencies in Class Differentiation," Mr. S. H. Swinny presiding. The lecturer quoted Professor Ridgeway (Presidential address to the Anthropological section of the British Association, 1908) as stating that ability was inherited, that in the United Kingdom the present differences in class were due to differences of ability, and that the presence of the middle and upper classes represented an evolutionary process of natural selection from the artisan and labouring classes. This statement was of great interest to the social reformer because if it were true the normal ability of the human individual was represented by that of the skilled labourer with his limited mental capacity and his narrow conception of life. The individual capable of cultured tastes and of a university education was abnormal and comparatively rare. Professor Ridgeway apparently assumed that inheritance of ability was regular and persistent and that barriers did not thwart ability. The object of Mr. D'aeth's paper was to shew that, while not questioning these two assumptions, the basis determining class had changed during the past 150 years from that of social position of the family to that of ability of the individual, and that the present class constitution was tending more accurately to represent a grading of ability. Class determination by family and birth which existed 150 years ago had been broken down by three forces: (1) the economic development of society, (2) the education movement, and (3) the formation of the large town. The complex construction of modern society had produced more occasion for ability. The keener demand for ability, more particularly business capacity and intellectual ability (especially in the departments of natural science, engineering, and economics) had brought the power and wealth of the country into the hands of these two groups and established them in the leading positions. Passage from one class to another was rendered much easier, not only on account of the removal of social barriers but also, partly by the enormous increase in the number of new posts—thus affording opportunity to hitherto undeveloped forms of ability; and partly by the much greater capacity for expansion within a single occupation—thus affording scope for degree of ability. Classes still existed: *e.g.*, the wealthy, the professional, the practical-ability class, the small trader, the skilled artisan, the unskilled labourer. Marriage tended to take place within the members of each group. There was very considerable variation of ability within the family. Each member, however, tended to work up or drift down according to his or her individual ability. In view of the importance of ability and its influence in determining the construction of society, it was desirable to study its forms, its distribution in a people, and the laws of its production and transmission.

THE OBSTACLES TO EUGENICS.

On Monday, March 8, at Clifford's Inn Hall, Fleet Street, Dr. C. W. Saleeby lectured on "The Obstacles to Eugenics," Mr. Frederic Harrison, president of the Society, in the chair. Dr. Saleeby's paper will probably appear in an early number of the *SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW*.

RACE PROGRESS AND RACE DEGENERACY

On Monday, March 22, at 24 Buckingham Street, W.C. (Mr. S. H. Swinny in the chair), Dr. G. Chatterton Hill read the paper on the above subject which appears in the present issue of this *REVIEW*.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

At a meeting, convened by Mr. Norman Brooks and Mr. A. Imbert Terry, and presided over by the Principal, Sir Oliver Lodge, in the medical theatre of Birmingham University on January 15, it was decided to found a Sociological Society in connection with the University. The Society has since come into being, and has held two meetings, at the first of which, on February 16, Mr. A. E. Zimmern, Fellow of New College, Oxford, read a paper on "Sociology, its Aims and Allies." The next meeting, on May 4, is to take the form of a symposium on Sweating. The Society has Professor J. H. Muirhead for president, Mr. Cranston Walker for chairman, Miss Hughes vice-chairman, and Mr. R. Edgar Ford secretary.

We learn with much pleasure that a German Sociological Society was established in Berlin at the beginning of January, the opening meeting being held on March 7, when Professor Simmel delivered a lecture on the nature and aims of Sociology and the scientific programme of the new society was discussed. It is hoped that, as the result of systematic endeavours to obtain a more prominent place for Sociology in university teaching, the society may succeed in establishing an Institute of Sociology and organising a central bureau of information for sociological inquirers. The honorary secretary is Dr. Hermann Beck; Professor F. Toennies, who in October last addressed our Society on "A Method of Statistical Inquiry," is a member of the Committee, and among the founders of the society are such prominent workers in the field as Herr H. Herkner and Herr Alfred Vierkandt of Berlin, Herr Paul Barth of Leipzig, Herr Julius Wolf of Breslau, and many others.

We have received the report, in three monthly numbers, of a Survey of Pittsburgh which has been conducted by "Charities and the Commons" in co-operation with the Russell Sage Foundation. The Survey, we are informed, has been carried out on the most elaborate scale. For nearly two years there have been from fifteen to twenty-five experts at work under the managing editor of the magazine, Mr. Paul U. Kellogg, who lived in Pittsburgh for most of this period, devoting himself exclusively to the work of the Survey. The cost of the undertaking has been between \$25,000 and \$30,000 exclusive of the expenses of publication. In addition to these magazine numbers a volume will appear in due time containing the more detailed and tabulated material. We shall hope to give an account of the results of the Survey in our next issue. The title of the magazine, "Charities and the Commons," has, we may note, been changed to "The Survey—Civic, Charitable, Social."

The seventh Congress of the International Institute of Sociology will be held this year at the University of Berne, and will be opened on the 20th of July. The subject will be Social Solidarity considered in its principles and applications to different countries and different periods. Communications should be addressed to the General Secretary, M. René Worms, Paris, Boulevard Saint-Germain, 115.